

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**FEDERAL ELECTION INTEGRITY
ACT OF 2006**

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1015, I call up the bill (H.R. 4844) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require any individual who desires to register or re-register to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate State election official with proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States to prevent fraud in Federal elections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1015, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4844

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. REQUIRING VOTERS TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.

(a) **REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION AS CONDITION OF RECEIVING BALLOT.**—Section 303(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15483(b)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "FOR VOTERS WHO REGISTER BY MAIL" and inserting "FOR PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATION"; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

"(1) **INDIVIDUALS VOTING IN PERSON.**—

"(A) **REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE IDENTIFICATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the appropriate State or local election official may not provide a ballot for an election for Federal office to an individual who desires to vote in person unless the individual presents to the official—

"(i) a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification; or

"(ii) in the case of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2010 and each subsequent election for Federal office, a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification for which the individual was required to provide proof of United States citizenship as a condition for the issuance of the identification.

"(B) **AVAILABILITY OF PROVISIONAL BALLOT.**—If an individual does not present the identification required under subparagraph (A), the individual shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot with respect to the election under section 302(a), except that the appropriate State or local election official may not make a determination under section 302(a)(4) that the individual is eligible under State law to vote in the election unless the individual presents the identification required under subparagraph (A) to the official not later than 48 hours after casting the provisional ballot.

"(2) **INDIVIDUALS VOTING OTHER THAN IN PERSON.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the appropriate State or local

election official may not accept any ballot for an election for Federal office provided by an individual who votes other than in person unless the individual submits with the ballot—

"(i) a copy of a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification; or

"(ii) in the case of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2010 and each subsequent election for Federal office, a copy of a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification for which the individual was required to provide proof of United States citizenship as a condition for the issuance of the identification.

"(B) **EXCEPTION FOR OVERSEAS MILITARY VOTERS.**—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to a ballot provided by an absent uniformed services voter who, by reason of active duty or service, is absent from the United States on the date of the election involved. In this subparagraph, the term 'absent uniformed services voter' has the meaning given such term in section 107(1) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–6(1)), other than an individual described in section 107(1)(C) of such Act.

"(3) **SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATIONS.**—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2)—

"(A) an identification is 'government-issued' if it is issued by the Federal Government or by the government of a State; and

"(B) an identification is one for which an individual was required to provide proof of United States citizenship as a condition for issuance if the identification displays an official marking or other indication that the individual is a United States citizen."

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 303 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15483) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "FOR VOTERS WHO REGISTER BY MAIL" and inserting "FOR PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATION"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "subsections (a)(5)(A)(i)(II) and (b)(3)(B)(i)(II)" and inserting "subsection (a)(5)(A)(i)(II)".

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by amending the item relating to section 303 to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. Computerized statewide voter registration list requirements and requirements for providing photo identification."

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—This section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2008 and each subsequent election for Federal office.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 303(d)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15483(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) **REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.**—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2008 and each subsequent election for Federal office."

SEC. 3. MAKING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS AVAILABLE.

(a) **REQUIRING STATES TO MAKE IDENTIFICATION AVAILABLE.**—Section 303(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15483(b)), as amended by section 2(a)(2), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) **MAKING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS AVAILABLE.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—During fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year, each State shall establish a program to provide photo identifications which may be used to meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) by individuals who desire to vote in elections held in the

State but who do not otherwise possess a government-issued photo identification.

"(B) **IDENTIFICATIONS PROVIDED AT NO COST TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS.**—If a State charges an individual a fee for providing a photo identification under the program established under subparagraph (A)—

"(i) the fee charged may not exceed the reasonable cost to the State of providing the identification to the individual; and

"(ii) the State may not charge a fee to any individual who provides an attestation that the individual is unable to afford the fee.

"(C) **IDENTIFICATIONS NOT TO BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**—Any photo identification provided under the program established under subparagraph (A) may not serve as a government-issued photo identification for purposes of any program or function of a State or local government other than the administration of elections."

(b) **PAYMENTS TO STATES TO COVER COSTS.**—Subtitle D of title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART 7—PAYMENTS TO COVER COSTS OF PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS

"SEC. 297. PAYMENTS TO COVER COSTS TO STATES OF PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS FOR VOTING TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) **PAYMENTS TO STATES.**—The Commission shall make payments to States to cover the costs incurred in providing photo identifications under the program established under section 303(b)(4) to individuals who are unable to afford the fee that would otherwise be charged under the program.

"(b) **AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.**—The amount of the payment made to a State under this part for any year shall be equal to the amount of fees which would have been collected by the State during the year under the program established under section 303(b)(4) but for the application of section 303(b)(4)(B)(ii), as determined on the basis of information furnished to the Commission by the State at such time and in such form as the Commission may require.

"SEC. 297A. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated for payments under this part such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year."

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the item relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

"PART 7—PAYMENTS TO COVER COSTS OF PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS

"Sec. 297. Payments to cover costs to States of providing photo identifications for voting to indigent individuals.

"Sec. 297A. Authorization of appropriations."

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4484, the Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006, and ask all my colleagues to support this important bill.

This bill will require presentation of a government-issued photo ID to vote

in Federal elections, effective November 2008. Though most of the voting public already has an ID that can meet this requirement, there is a percentage of eligible voters who do not have an ID, so these extra 2 years will give them time to acquire it.

To ensure that only citizens are voting, the amendment will require presentation by 2010 of an ID that could not have been obtained without providing proof of citizenship. Once obtained, this ID can be used to prove both citizenship and identity when voting.

This Congress has previously enacted the REAL ID Act which will require people to prove their legal status in the country to get a REAL ID. That act has to be implemented by May 2008. Citizens will be able to use the IDs they obtain under this process to vote in elections starting in 2010 and for all elections thereafter. H.R. 4844 will require the ID to include some indicia of citizenship, so poll workers and other election officials will be able to tell that the bearer is a citizen.

Those who arrive at the polls without an ID will be permitted to cast a provisional ballot. These ballots will be counted if the person returns and presents to an election official a qualifying ID within 48 hours. To help those who need but cannot afford the ID to vote, the amendment requires States to provide them free of cost to the indigent and authorizes funds to reimburse States for the cost of doing so.

To most people this proposal is a simple, commonsense proposal and a necessary safeguard against vote fraud. To others it represents a dangerous threat to some citizens' ability to access the polls. While this debate may be heated in Washington, D.C., it seems the American people have made up their mind. A recent NBC-Wall Street Journal poll showed that 81 percent of those surveyed favored an ID requirement for voting. A Rasmussen poll during that same time period showed a similar result. Seventy-seven percent surveyed favored an ID requirement for voting.

Likewise, the bipartisan Carter-Baker Commission on Federal Election Reform recommended a national voter ID requirement in the report they issued last year. While the division on this issue may be partisan here in Congress, it certainly was not on this bipartisan commission. It seems a large bipartisan majority there concluded by an 18-3 vote that requiring ID is a necessary reform.

Once implemented, H.R. 4844 will put an important safeguard in place that will enhance the integrity of our system and help restore confidence in it. By putting in place procedures that ensure voting is limited to eligible citizens, we can encourage participation and increase turnout.

The experience in Arizona is instructive here. Despite all the claims that disenfranchisement would ensue after the enactment of the proof of citizenship and ID requirements in Propo-

sition 200, testimony in Phoenix revealed that registration went up 15 percent after the requirement to prove citizenship went into effect. The fact is, people are encouraged to vote when they believe their vote will count and know that their vote will not be canceled out by an illegal vote.

I know there will be some who oppose the action we will take today, and there will be some controversy generated by the proposal. I wish it were not so. It seems we should all be able to agree that voting should be limited to citizens of the United States, because that has been the law for years. If we can agree on that, we should be able to agree that our voting systems must have procedures in place to ensure that.

We should all be able to agree that every eligible citizen should be able to vote, should be encouraged to vote, to vote only once, and to be assured that their vote will not be diluted by an illegal vote. If we agree on that, we should be able to agree that making people identify themselves when they vote is a simple and necessary safeguard.

It was not always so. I grew up in a small town, Edgerton, Minnesota, with 800 people. They did not need photo IDs. They knew everyone in town. If a stranger had showed up to vote, he would have been ushered out of the hall. But today we live in urban cities, by and large. We do not know each other well, and we need some means of foolproof identification.

I am sure that we will hear from the other side of the aisle today that an ID requirement is not necessary and is too much trouble. But every day millions of Americans show a photo ID to pay by check, board a plane or buy alcohol or tobacco. Surely the sanctity of the ballot warrants as much protection as these other activities.

In too many States, lax identification requirements mean people can cast votes without ever having to prove their eligibility. Our voting rights are too important to rely on an honor system. We need to make sure we have procedures in place that protect the right to vote and make sure only eligible citizens are able to do so.

I hope all Members will recognize the need for these necessary reforms. They will advance the security of our electoral systems, increase confidence in their integrity and reduce the opportunities for fraud. I ask all Members to support this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought as a girl growing up in Birmingham, Alabama, that I would meet, again, a present-day poll tax. My goodness. My father would be really amazed.

Therefore, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4844, the so-called Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006, which requires all States to demand

that voters provide government-issued identification in order to vote in the 2008 election and proof of citizenship in order to vote in the 2010 election.

The Republican Party has acted without expressing any concern for the millions of American citizens who currently do not have the necessary documentation and consequently will be denied their right to vote. Further, the majority has not been moved by the realization that the burden of this legislation falls disproportionately on the elderly, the disabled, and ethnic minorities. Unfortunately, the Republicans made no effort to determine how many would be affected and be disenfranchised by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with H.R. 4844, this Republican legislation devises a modern-day poll tax in the form of a proof of citizenship requirement that will keep some eligible voters from voting and make it harder for all American citizens to vote. No citizen should have to pay in order to exercise his or her constitutional right to vote.

I have heard today on this Floor that President Carter's and Secretary of State Baker's reference to IDs fit within the intent of this bill. Allow me to clarify this assertion. Their ID proposal does not have requirements for citizenship, and they wish that everyone, not just those who can not afford IDs, possess them free of charge. They have not endorsed this piece of legislation.

Proof of citizenship requirements place on the voter the difficult, time-consuming and costly burden of obtaining the necessary documentation to prove citizenship or identity in order to cast a vote. For example, our State Department reports that only 23 percent of all Americans possess a passport, and the cost of obtaining one exceeds \$100. A majority of Americans do not currently possess the identification required by H.R. 4844, and requiring them to obtain one imposes an unconstitutional burden on their right to vote.

Additionally, some Americans may be unable to acquire the necessary documents at any cost because they lack a birth certificate. We recognize that there are many minorities, especially African Americans, who were delivered by midwives, who did not have and do not have a birth certificate. There are some rural Americans who do not have birth certificates. We recognize that the State of Georgia indicates that 40 percent of their seniors would be denied their right to vote if this piece of legislation passes.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Help America Vote Act, HAVA, strikes the appropriate balance between voter-ballot access and system-ballot integrity, and it was accomplished with bipartisan effort. The Committee on House Administration worked tirelessly to enact HAVA as a solution to the problems associated with the November 2000 general election. As a result of HAVA, \$3.1 billion was appropriated to

the States to improve the voting process. My alternative calls for the \$800 million in shortfall funding to ensure full funding of HAVA.

The question of citizenship was directly addressed head on in HAVA whereby Congress mandated that the mail-in registration form includes a box that asks the question, "Are you a citizen of the United States of America?" If you answer no, your form is rejected automatically. If you answer yes, and you are discovered not to be a citizen, you are subject to Federal prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, we have laws on the books that if someone votes illegally, he or she will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The penalties are stiff and have successfully served as a deterrent to misrepresentation.

The voter ID question was asked and answered by HAVA. HAVA provided a broad range of ID options for the narrow circumstances of first-time voters who register by mail or appear in person at the polls to cast their vote. A photo ID is only one option. All the other options include employment ID, student ID, a current utility bill, bank statement, paychecks, or a government document showing the name and address of the voter.

□ 1400

Neither voters nor States are required to comply with a one-size-fit-all Federal mandate. The unavoidable consequence of enacting H.R. 4844 will be the decrease in the number of American citizens who are able to vote. H.R. 4844 will do far more to suppress turnout and intimidate voters than to prevent voter fraud, the purported objective of the majority.

Now, we say to all of us here in Congress, if we know of fraud and of persons voting illegally, we should tell our district attorneys. We should not tarry on this type of thing, and I suggest to the majority, if they know of any fraud, please call their district attorneys. We do not need this type of bill to accomplish this task.

We should be, as Members of Congress, representing the people and this people's House to do just that. For all the concern that the majority expresses about protecting the right to vote, this bill does nothing to stop voter suppression or correct the numerous administrative problems that are plaguing our elections and robbing our citizens of their right to vote.

I also previously heard that Andrew Young is in support of this bill. In fact, we understand that Andrew Young is not in support of this bill and that his remarks have been taken out of context. He is opposed to this bill.

H.R. 4844, as amended, will do nothing to stop the intentional forms of voter suppression such as the instances in 2004 when unsuspecting voters were misinformed about the time or place of the election or about the qualifications for voting. This bill will not remedy the long lines, misallocation of voting

equipment, voting registration rules, or other election procedures that deny citizens their very critical opportunity to vote.

These are the real issues that this Congress should be addressing. To that end, I have offered a substitute piece of legislation that addresses some of the problems of voter suppression and voter fraud that are not addressed in H.R. 4844. Our Congress should be improving voter access to the polls, preventing election fraud, paying for and supporting election integrity, but it was not made in order. In fact, this is a closed rule, which is what happens when the majority does not want us to bring real legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, because of the critical adverse impact of this bill and the affect it will have on our citizens' constitutional right to vote, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 4844. Instead of making it difficult to vote, our job should be, in the people's House, to promote civic participation more broadly.

There are 40 percent of registered voters who are not voting in our elections. This issue is what we should be addressing. Instead of erecting new barriers to voting participation, we should be devoting our resources to prosecuting the illegal intimidation tactics and solving the election irregularities which continue to surface with each election cycle.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) one of the most honorable persons in the Chamber, one who has served well for so many years, the sponsor of this bill, who has worked tirelessly for this Congress and for the people of the United States, including on this bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. EHLERS. I appreciate your warm, gracious words.

There is a story that goes around in my hometown, Chicago. It says, Bury me when I die in Chicago because I want to stay active in politics after I am gone. This is not the problem we face here, but I thought I would mention that anyway.

I rise in support of H.R. 4844, the Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006, because the election system is the bedrock that our Republic is built on and its security and oversight is of paramount concern. The Constitution places the responsibility within this House to certify Federal elections, and we "may at any time by law make or alter such regulations."

It is the law that only U.S. citizens have the right to vote in Federal elections, but our current system does not give State election officials the tools they need to ensure that this requirement is being met, which is why I have introduced this bill.

This bill will help election officials ensure accuracy at the polls on election day. It amends Public Law 103-31,

popularly known as the "motor-voter bill," to require voters to show a current official photo ID obtained with proof of their U.S. citizenship before voting. This bill's requirements will extend nationwide for all Federal elections.

H.R. 4844's provisions take effect gradually, allowing voters time to adjust. In 2008, voters will have to show a current official photo ID, and in 2010, they will have to display a photo ID that was obtained by providing proof of their U.S. citizenship. A voter who forgets his ID on election day will be allowed to cast a provisional ballot and will have 48 hours to present an ID to an election official to validate the ballot. Furthermore, and this is so important, voters who cannot afford an ID will be issued a free ID at no cost. That is some kind of poll tax when somebody else pays for it. That is my kind of tax. Funds will be appropriated, they are contemplated by this legislation, to assist States in implementing the providing of a free ID.

Opponents argue requiring a photo ID backed by proof of citizenship erects obstacles to citizen participation. That is certainly not true. This bill is designed to increase participation by ensuring that each legitimate vote will be counted and not be diluted by fraud.

There are many elections in this country every cycle that are decided by just a handful of votes. How can we be certain that these elections, without measures to certify the identity of voters, are not being decided by fraudulent voters?

Opponents often claim that requiring a photo ID is a solution in search of a problem. This argument is erroneous because election officials cannot determine if a problem exists because they do not have the tools to verify voters' identities on election day, nor when they register.

Our laws operate largely on trust, trust that voters are truthful in checking a box certifying that they are U.S. citizens. No documentation is required. Under the current law, all you need to establish your identity when registering to vote by mail is a utility bill or bank statement, documents easily forged and which do not give any indication of citizenship.

Our election system is too important to be safeguarded by mere honesty alone. We must have verification.

Opponents claim that there are strict punishments already in place to deter voter fraud. I agree there are sanctions in place, but they are toothless measures when election officials do not have the tools they need to concretely establish a voter's identity on election day.

Broad popular support exists for this bill. Photo IDs were called for in the 2005 report issued by the bipartisan Commission on Federal Election Reform.

Many States have recognized voter fraud is a problem and passed photo ID laws as protective measures. Arizona

voters recently passed a law requiring valid photo IDs for elections, and 22 States have implemented laws that require all voters to show identification when casting a ballot.

Let me summarize by saying our voting rights were won by Americans who were willing to lay down their lives for the freedom to elect our representatives, and it is our duty to safeguard that freedom. If we do not, our elections become meaningless.

This bill upholds the integrity of this election system for everybody.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN), a distinguished and outstanding member of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, there is something we can all agree on in this Chamber and that is that only Americans get to vote, and they only get to vote once. But what we are talking about in this bill is disenfranchising many of those Americans. It is already a felony for a non-American to vote.

Now, when this bill was introduced, the committee made it part of Immigration August. We had hearings around the country, and what we found out was that the issue of so-called illegal aliens voting basically does not occur.

As the League of Women Voters has said, the voter fraud addressed by this bill is a rare problem, and the witness in New Mexico said she had never seen it in her entire professional career. And if you think about it, it makes sense. Illegal aliens are sneaking across the border for a job, not to vote.

We also got testimony that the impact of this will disproportionately affect poor people and African Americans. In fact, in a Milwaukee study, they found that 78 percent of the African American men aged 18 to 24 had no driver's license. Why? Because they are too poor to have a car and they do not have a license.

In New Mexico, we heard from Mr. Yahzee, a Navajo, who told us that the Navajos basically do not have this ID and they cannot get it either because they do not have birth certificates, they do not have electricity, they do not have phones. They do not have the document, but they are the original Americans. They were the code talkers. They are entitled to vote, but under this bill they would not be able to vote. I do not know about this poll, but I think if you ask 81 percent of Americans whether the Navajo should not be allowed to vote, they would say, well, of course not.

Now, recently there was a measure put into place to have Medicaid recipients have a photo ID, and we had to repeal that rule. And you know why? Because we would have had to see old people evicted from nursing homes because they could not come up with that photo ID. Well, I tell you, if you cannot come up with a photo ID to save your

life, you are not going to be able to come up with a photo ID to vote either. That must be why the AARP is against this measure.

So why is this before us today? We have no evidence there is a problem. We have ample evidence in the testimony that this will disenfranchise many Americans.

I must say that the Republican Party is doing this throughout the United States. This is the measure to disenfranchise African Americans, Native Americans. It is wrong and we will not stand for it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the chairman for the time. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, we deal with an issue today that could likely determine the long-term fate of our Republic. As Mr. HYDE just pointed out, voting is the bedrock of our Republic, and today we deal with voter fraud.

The U.S. Constitution and the constituents of several States clearly define the legal requirements to vote. A voter must be of minimum age. They must be a citizen of the United States, and each voter must vote only once. I do not think anybody in this body would disagree with that.

What we discuss today or debate is over how do we enforce the voter laws we have on the books.

A tamper-proof photo ID is the only practical way to prevent the mass input of fraudulent voters into our system. Some say, oh, we do not have any. How the heck do we know we do not have any? We do not check anybody to see if they are fraudulent or not.

That was the recommendation of the nonpartisan Federal Election Reform Commission, headed by former Democratic President Jimmy Carter and former Republican Secretary of State James Baker.

□ 1415

It is also the opinion, by the way, if anybody is interested, of 80 to 90 percent of the American public. It happens in every poll that is taken on this issue. My State of Georgia, in fact, has already passed such a requirement. They have even gone back and amended the law to include free State-issued photo IDs for anyone who needs one.

But that is not good enough for some. Yesterday, the State Superior Court Judge T. Jackson Bedford, Jr., legislated on the court and ruled that requiring a photo ID, in his opinion, is unconstitutional because it imposes a duty on the voter not specifically required in our State constitution. I feel very certain our Supreme Court will satisfy this problem within the next couple of weeks. He did not address, however, Legislator Judge Jackson Bedford, Jr., the fact that, without the photo ID, the legal votes of hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens could negate

the legal ballots of hundreds of thousands of our citizens around the country. He did not address the fact that, without a photo ID, tens of thousands of partisans could fraudulently vote in another person's name and cast multiple ballots, negating the legal ballots of our citizens. He did not address the fact that legal voters of Georgia have spoken loud and clear over and over through their lawfully elected representatives that this measure is needed, and it is desired.

He did not, meaning the legislative judge, address that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to each State a republican form of government, and this ruling directly conflicts with the perfect right of the citizens of Georgia. Our Governor and State legislature must fight this tyrant in Georgia.

But we can speak loud and clear against those who show their contempt against the right of the American voters across our Nation. We can stop election fraud today by voting for this magnificent restoration of our constitutional rights by my friend and my colleague Chairman HYDE.

Defend the Republic. Support this bill.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. The gentleman from Georgia is absolutely right. If we need to go after fraud, we need to get some quantitative information before we bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 1 minute to our distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

"This cannot be." With those words, State Judge Jackson Bedford yesterday struck down the infamous Georgia photo ID law. Let me repeat. "This cannot be." Let these words guide us here, because right here in this House of Representatives we take an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution guarantees all American citizens the right to vote and the right for their vote to be counted.

I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California, the ranking Democrat on the House Administration Committee, for her leadership on this issue. She has been an important force in protecting the integrity of elections. And that is why it is so sad to see this bill come here to the floor today, especially named the Federal Election Integrity Act.

Integrity? It is not about integrity. It is about a tawdry attempt by Republicans to suppress the votes of millions of Americans. That is not integrity.

America is a beacon of democracy to the world. We must continue to send a message to the world that we honor the oath of office that we take to protect and defend the Constitution. Every eligible citizen must be able to vote, to exercise his or her right to vote, and those votes must be counted.

Only a short month ago, many of us stood here, stood proudly on the White

House lawn as the Voting Rights Act reauthorization was signed into law. We overcame many obstacles even for the reauthorization of that legislation to affirm the most precious right of our democracy, the right to vote.

Today, however, we are undermining that right to vote, and we are undermining the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, and, in doing so, we are undermining our democracy. Though the right to vote is the foundation of our democracy, the bill we debate today is indeed a disenfranchisement of millions of American voters, the elderly, African Americans, Asian Americans, Latino Americans, and, get this, Native Americans. Native Americans, people here longer than any of our families, unless we can proudly boast of being Native American. People with disabilities. The list goes on.

As the NAACP has said, this bill would disenfranchise many of the very citizens that the Voting Rights Act is designed to protect. And the Republicans call that integrity. I don't think so.

A few weeks ago President Bush spoke before the NAACP in the first time in his Presidency. He quoted President Lyndon Johnson in saying that voting rights are the lifeblood of a democracy. And yet, here today, after making that great statement, quoting that great civil rights and voting rights President, President Bush is here today in a transparent, it is obvious to all, attempt to suppress the votes of millions of American citizens, cutting off the lifeblood of democracy. Is that integrity? I don't think so.

Supporters of this Republican voter suppression bill would claim that this bill is about preventing noncitizens from voting. It is just the opposite; it is a bill designed to prevent citizens from voting. Noncitizens are strictly prohibited under law from voting and face tough penalties for breaking these laws. And that is right. No one condones fraud. There is little evidence anywhere in the country of a significant problem with noncitizen voters. As our distinguished ranking member pointed out, if you want to make a case, document it, just don't claim it and then come through with a clear and transparent attempt to cut off the votes of those who do not share your political point of view. You didn't take an oath of office to do that.

This bill is not about noncitizens as its supporters claim. Rather, it affects all American citizens by making them prove that they are, in fact, citizens even if they have voted for years. By forcing voters to undergo time-consuming, burdensome, and expensive attempts to secure documents, this Republican voter suppression bill is a modern-day poll tax. It would especially impact our elderly citizens and low-income citizens, and disproportionately affect minority individuals and individuals with disabilities, many of whom do not drive and cannot afford passports. This bill suspiciously ap-

pears to target and disenfranchise American voters who might not be sympathetic to Republican policy goals. Again, a modern-day poll tax. And the Republicans call this modern-day poll tax integrity. I don't think so.

We have a responsibility to remove all obstacles to participation to the right of all American citizens to participate in the electoral process. And yet, the AARP has said that the obstacles this bill throws up to voting, that they are particularly concerned about that such rules will prevent many eligible older voters from exercising their right to vote. That is why they join the NAACP, the League of Women Voters, and this long list of over 110 organizations, civil liberties, civil rights groups opposing this legislation.

It even goes into health, United Church of Christ, the United Methodist Church, United States Steelworkers, United States Student Association. How about this. The list goes on. But it even talks about some of the groups that deal with the disabilities community in our country. The Navajo Nation. I will put it in the RECORD for all to see. The League of Women Voters, the NAACP, AARP. The list goes on.

GROUPS OPPOSED TO VOTER ID BILL—
SEPTEMBER 20, 2006

African American Ministers in Action
ACORN
Advancement Project
Aguila Youth Leadership Institute
Alliance for Retired Americans
American Association of People with Disabilities
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
American Association of University Women
American Civil Liberties Union
American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona
American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL—CIO)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
American Immigration Lawyers Association
American Jewish Committee
American Policy Center
Americans for Democratic Action
Anti-Defamation League
Arizona Advocacy Network
Arizona Consumers Council
Arizona Hispanic Community Forum
Arizona Students' Association
Asian American Justice Center
Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund
Asian and Pacific Islander American Vote (APIA Vote)
Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL—CIO
Brennan Center for Justice
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law
Center for Digital Democracy
Common Cause
Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility
Concerned Foreign Service Officers
Congressional Hispanic Caucus
Consumer Action
Cyber Privacy Project
Democratic Women's Working Group
Demos
Demos: A Network for Ideas & Action
Electronic Frontier Foundation
Electronic Privacy Information Center

Emigrantes Sin Fronteras
Fairfax County Privacy Council
FairVote
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Hispanic Federation
Hispanic National Bar Association
Interfaith Worker Justice of Arizona
Intertribal Council of Arizona
Japanese American Citizens League (JACL)
Jewish Council for Public Affairs
La Union Del Pueblo Entero (LUPE)
Labor Council for Latin American Advancement
Laborers International
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
League of United Latin American Citizens
League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson
League of Women Voters of the United States
League of Young Voters Education Fund
Legal Momentum
Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund
National Center for Transgender Equality
National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)
National Congress of American Indians
National Council of Jewish Women
National Council of La Raza
National Disability Rights Network
National Education Association
National Immigration Forum
National Korean American Service & Education Consortium
National Urban League
National Voting Rights Institute
Navajo Nation
New York Public Interest Research Group, Inc./NYPIRG
Ohio Taxpayers Association & OTA Foundation
Philip Randolph Institute
People for the American Way Foundation
Project for Arizona's Future
Project Vote
Protection and Advocacy System
Rainbow PUSH Coalition
Republican Liberty Caucus
Rock the Vote
SEIU Local 5 Arizona
Service Employees International Union (SEIU)
Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF)
Somos America/We Are America
Southwest Voter Registration Education Project
The Arc of the United States
The Multiracial Activist
The Rutherford Institute
Tohono O'odham Nation
Transgender Law Center
U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
U.S. PIRG
Union for Reform Judaism
Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
United Auto Workers
United Cerebral Palsy
United Church of Christ Justice & Witness Ministries
United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society
United States Student Association
United Steelworkers
United Workers of America
UNITE—HERE
Velvet Revolution
William C. Velasquez Institute

YWCA USA

Mr. Speaker, the general public should understand what this bill means to them. This doesn't mean that you don't have to prove your identity at the polls. Many States permit forms of identification such as Social Security cards and utility bills when voting. What this bill does do, though, is starting in 2008, voters would have to present a government-issued photo ID that many do not have. Or, if you are voting by mail, you have to send in your picture. I mean, what is this? Submit it before getting a ballot. And, starting in 2010, that ID would also have to show proof of U.S. citizenship. This cannot be.

But just if you are a person out there listening to this debate, and you think, my Social Security card is not enough? The fact that I have voted in this community over time is not enough? Where is the basis of our democracy, which is truth and trust? It is completely lacking in this bill. And they call it integrity.

As we know from experience, Republican promises to authorize funds for identification are meaningless. They say, oh, we are going to authorize. We are supposed to have had \$800 million allocated to remove obstacles of participation and to facilitate voting, but because that would expand the universe of people who have access to the right to vote, the Republicans have rejected it for fear of the result of that turnout. Republicans have a history of underfunding electoral reform. Again, they have underfunded the Help America Vote Act by \$800 million. How they can explain that, I don't know. I know one thing, it is not about integrity.

Mr. Speaker, problems with voting that were apparent in the elections of 2000 and 2004 are well-known to the American people, and they are of great concern to the American people. Those elections have uncomfortable echoes to a past that had been long left behind. In the 2004 elections, voters in predominantly minority districts reported higher rates of inactive voter registrations, a greater percentage of inadequately staffed and equipped polling places, inconsistent treatment of provisional ballots, many of which were never counted, and sometimes even a lack of an adequate number of ballots.

Even with the best intentions, it is challenging, as we saw in the State of Maryland last week. But if the design is to thwart voter participation, how much of a disadvantage is the average voter?

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, in one of our Nation's finest hours, our country came together as a Nation to overcome bigotry and injustice and to secure the fundamental right to vote. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act, we said that we would no longer tolerate the many nefarious methods, poll taxes, literacy tax, grandfather clauses, and, as our colleague JOHN LEWIS can attest, brutal violence that had been used to deny African Ameri-

cans and other minority citizens the right to vote. Today this legislation seeks to turn back the clock. And they call it integrity.

Those of us who take an oath of office, I go back to that oath over and over again, promise to uphold the Constitution. We are committing ourselves to ensuring that everyone who is eligible to vote is able to vote, and that every vote will be counted. Any diminishment, any diminishment of America's citizens voting is a diminishment of our democracy. This cannot be.

□ 1430

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), the future Governor of Wisconsin.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4844, the Federal Election Integrity Act.

Mr. Speaker, our democracy can withstand many things and that is what our history shows. But one thing it cannot withstand is doubt over the outcome of elections. We have to know whoever wins, your guy, my guy, conservative, liberal, Republican or Democrat, he or she really won. Won, in fact. It is the only way our leaders have the moral authority they need to take on the great challenges of our times.

As others have noted, we have had far too many elections in recent years where serious questions have emerged over irregularities and even fraud. During the last Federal election in 2004 in my home State, Wisconsin, Wisconsin found itself mired with out-of-date voter lists, fake names, invalid addresses, double and triple voting, and ballots cast by convicted felons. Our State's largest newspaper found almost 300 cases of felons voting illegally, at least 100 cases of double voting, and 1,200 votes from invalid addresses. And the list goes on and on and on.

Every one of those illegal votes cancels out a vote legally cast, cancels out a vote from a citizen for whom that right is so precious and so fundamental to our Nation's future.

A photo ID will not solve all of these problems, not by a long shot. But it is definitely a step in the right direction, a step that I believe most Americans support, a step that I know most Wisconsinites support. That is why last year I introduced comprehensive election reform legislation that would have required a valid photo ID to vote in any Federal election.

It is also why I am proud to support this legislation from Chairman HYDE. It is legislation whose time has come. It is a way of ensuring integrity in elections.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a great civil rights leader and icon from the great State of Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, my colleague, the gentlewoman from California for yielding and for all of her great work.

Mr. Speaker, just 3 months ago this body passed the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, admitting the sad fact that voter discrimination is still a reality in this great Nation. This Congress decided we could do better, that history required us to protect the right of all Americans to vote.

Today this bill moves us in a different direction, the wrong direction. This bill, like the unconstitutional Georgia photo ID bill and so many other photo ID schemes throughout the country, is an attack on the voting rights of millions of American citizens.

I am beyond disgusted. I am shocked. I find it hard to believe that the Republican leaders in Congress will put election year games ahead of the voting rights of American citizens. We fought too long, fought too hard, and suffered too long for the right to vote. People died to participate in the democratic process. We must not turn back the clock. We must not go back. We must go forward and open up the political process and let all American citizens come in.

Call it what you may, this bill is a modern-day poll tax; \$10 or \$15 for a birth certificate, \$100 for a passport, this is a poll tax. There is no other way to say it. It costs money to get a birth certificate. It costs money to get a passport. Why put an extra burden on American citizens to exercise their most precious right, their right to vote? There is no reason.

Citizens will be denied the right to vote. This is no less than voter suppression. We should open up the process to each and every American citizen. Instead, this bill returns us to our dark past. Vote "no" on this photo ID bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to observe for a moment there will be no expense to any voter. It will be paid by the Federal Government if the voter has to pay money to get a birth certificate or a photo ID.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another member of the House Administration Committee, Mr. JOHN MICA of Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman EHLERS for yielding me this time, and I thank him for bringing out a bill that is both a reasonable bill, a bill that looks out for the interests of the poor and those that could be deprived of the right to vote.

I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). He is a hero among heroes, and I am here to tell you if this bill in any way infringed on anyone's ability to vote or discriminated on any basis of allowing them to have access to the polls, I would not support it.

But what we have in this legislation which has been so ably crafted is legislation by a bipartisan commission, 21 members led by two very distinguished individuals, the gentleman from Georgia, the former President Carter, and the gentleman from Texas, former Secretary of State Jim Baker, a 21-member commission, and by a vote of 18-21,

only three dissenters, they asked for and recommend this for protection of the ballot.

Now we have been discussing here, day after day, border security. And we want our borders safe. This issue is what Americans want. They want safe borders and they want safe ballots.

I come from the State of Florida where we had the question of who voted. This gives us protection because it asks for minimal identification. So it is a good recommendation and it is a recommendation because we don't want 50 States and some States with different levels of requirements. We have a national standard, and that is what was recommended by the commission to ensure that we have a safe and secure ballot, ensure that we not only are protecting our borders but we are protecting our ballots.

In Florida you can have a requirement for identification to buy a six-pack or a pack of cigarettes. The very least we can ask is for someone who is going to cast a ballot that is so precious in our democratic process to show some identification, and I think this is a good measure. I urge its passage.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. MICA, perhaps you do want to consider not voting for the bill because 60 percent of new registrants in Pima County, AZ who are all eligible voters, were initially rejected. And for every 1 percent of individuals who do not have the necessary documentation of citizenship, 2 million voters are disenfranchised.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1½ minutes to a man who does know about all of this, a former Secretary of State, the Honorable JIM LANGEVIN from Rhode Island.

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4844 because of the dangerous impact it would have on voter participation in the United States. When I was Secretary of State, I led an effort to reform our elections. We replaced our outdated voting equipment, made polling places accessible, and significantly reduced error rates.

My job was to make voting open and accessible to eligible citizens, and to encourage people to participate in the process. From that experience, I know this legislation would practically do nothing to reduce fraud, while creating new barriers for Americans to vote.

Should H.R. 4844 become law, fewer eligible citizens will be able to vote because they lack proper identification or documentation. Maybe it is an elderly woman who leaves her home of 50 years to enter an assisted-living facility. It could be a resident of New Orleans whose public records were lost in Hurricane Katrina. The list goes on and on. However, these people have one thing in common: Once they are turned away from voting, it is unlikely they

will return. They may not return that day because of a lack of time or transportation; or they may not return in future elections because of the hassle they experienced. New obstacles to voting will cause many to drop out of the Nation's election system because it failed them.

Not only would the bill make it harder for every American to vote, but it would also add massive new compliance requirements for election officials. It also unnecessarily duplicates current law, which requires that voters in Federal elections be U.S. citizens.

Fraudulent voter registration is a felony punishable by 5 years in prison. Furthermore, the bill does not address other, more prevalent forms of voter fraud and additional problems that we have witnessed in recent elections.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a proud record of removing barriers and increasing the opportunity of all Americans to vote. It guaranteed the right to vote to citizens whose only disqualification was the color of their skin. It opened polling places to the disabled. It extended the franchise to Americans living overseas. It did all of this on a bipartisan basis and while maintaining the integrity of our elections.

H.R. 4844 is a step away from that proud tradition because it would erect new barriers for eligible citizens and disenfranchise many Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 4844 so that we may preserve the most precious right, the right to vote.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) who was kind enough to host us when we held a hearing in his State.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support H.R. 4844. On election day in 2000, President Bush was ahead by 31,000 votes. Before the Secretary of State of New Mexico certified the election 23 days later, the last State to certify, that gap had been closed to just 5,000 votes, and the voting was about 80–20 the reverse direction. The estimate of fraud in that particular election was 7 percent in statewide fraud.

One of the greatest frauds that is perpetrated in New Mexico is that voting workers, campaign workers, come in and read over the shoulder of the poll workers and find out names that have not been signed in. And magically, that is the next name that appears. That is the next person in line that comes up and signs his name, and it works over and over again through the day.

It was against the law, and when candidates began to enforce the law, in 2004 the New Mexico legislature went in and cured the problem. They went in and said it is okay, it is okay for that worker to come in, look over the shoulder and find a blank line and sign in. In fact, in New Mexico it is against the law, it is against the law to check for photo ID or any kind of registration even if you know that the person is not the right person that is signing.

So that is the reason that I think a bipartisan commission supported this

bill. At the end of the day, the integrity of the election process is the confidence in the process.

This is not about who gets elected. This is about making sure that each person gets one vote and one vote only. For those who would say call the district attorney, I would tell you when the college students signed in and called us at 8, saying someone had already voted in their place, I am here with my picture ID and they say I am already signed in and it was someone else, the district attorney says if you can't find a warm body signing the line at the time, then you have no case.

The county clerk in the county where these problems occurred was convicted of four counts of felony fraud on election day; yet the Secretary of State would not pursue the case. I support this bill because it begins to restore some integrity to the election process. We on this side will not allow disenfranchisement. We will not allow votes to be suppressed, but we do need to clean up the mess that exists in many States. I thank the gentleman for bringing this bill to the floor.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) for yielding me this time.

We have had eloquent testimony and speeches dealing with the practicality of why this bill is unconstitutional. But more than that, let it be clear, let's pull the covers off of this, this is nothing but a bold attempt, a shameless attempt by the Republican Party to target those types of voters that they believe will not vote for them but would vote for Democrats. That is exactly what it is.

I am here to tell you the truth about this because I am from Georgia where this very same bill has been ruled unconstitutional once, not unconstitutional twice, three times it has been ruled unconstitutional by a Federal judge, and just yesterday by the Superior Court of Fulton County, the largest county in my State.

□ 1445

It has been ruled unconstitutional. And the reason is this: The Constitution and the Framers of the Constitution made it very clear. They said that the right to vote shall not be abridged, shall not be infringed upon. That is the anchor. That is the basic thrust.

You come here and talk about needing a picture ID to get on a plane, to get on a bus. Well, the right to get on a plane must not be infringed was not written into the Constitution, but the right to vote was. And if Alexander Hamilton was right, if Thomas Jefferson was right, ought not we be right? If Madison was right, shouldn't we be right? If Abraham Lincoln was right, shouldn't we be right? If Martin Luther King, Jr., was right, shouldn't we be

right? When Lyndon Baines Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act, he said the same thing. All throughout our history, and why?

Here are you, the Republicans, doing this dastardly un-American act. And if John Lewis, who got his head bloodied on Edmund Pettus Bridge, says it is right, then it should be right. And the right thing to do is to vote down this dastardly un-American bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. WALDEN for purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

As the chairman knows, I support the fact that citizens should have the right to vote and that the citizens' vote should be counted, and the way to do that is to prove your citizenship. That is what American elections are all about, so we do not have people here illegally who are voting.

My concern with this legislation applies specifically to my State of Oregon, which is entirely vote by mail, and the provisions contained in this bill before us today give me some pause. And I would like to know that I have the chairman's support in working with us in a conference to address these issues.

In my district, 70,000 square miles, if every voter every time has to photocopy their ID and put it with a ballot that they send in, it raises some issues. I think there are other ways to guarantee that only citizens get ballots to vote, and I would appreciate your support in trying to address that issue in conference.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I recognize the concern of the gentleman from Oregon, and we will certainly try to work with him. We will solicit ideas not only from his State, but also from the State of Washington, which has a considerable amount of mail-in voting. And I would certainly like also to hear from the secretary of state of both States and several county clerks from each State for ways that we can accomplish the goal of the bill, which is to ensure that every citizen has the right to vote, and only those who have the right to vote will be allowed to vote. There may be more than one way to accomplish that.

We will be happy to work with you when the bill reaches conference with the Senate.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I appreciate that commitment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for another colloquy.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague from Michigan how this bill will impact those whose religious convictions prevent them from having their photo taken for government ID. I represent some 25,000 members of the Amish community. Many of them do vote, but, because of

their religious beliefs, will not allow their photo to be taken. They wouldn't object to a fingerprint or biometrics. But I would respectfully ask the gentleman to explain how the bill deals with this issue, given our Nation's long tradition of protecting freedom of religion, and if this matter could be addressed as the bill moves along.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for raising the question. This is not the first time it has come up. There are other groups. Many of the American Indians have raised a similar objection, and I am quite sure that once we get in conference with the Senate, we will be able to hear from that group and all the other groups, the Amish, the Native Americans, and find another method to ensure identity.

Clearly biometrics would be equally acceptable as a photo ID. Thumbprints are generally not reproducible for other fraud; so I believe this will help deal with the issue.

Mr. PITTS. I thank the gentleman.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this just shows you how flawed this bill is. This bill should have remained in committee so we could really crank out and clear up some of these problems. We have heard two colloquies from the majority on issues that are not a part of this bill, for heaven's sake.

At this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman whose State has thrown out a similar type of law, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable WILLIAM CLAY.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With little to no evidence of past fraud, it is outrageous that my Republican colleagues are going to extraordinary lengths to suppress Democratic votes.

H.R. 4844 would impose undue hardship on seniors, women, minorities, the disabled, and lower-income voters, who are all less likely to have proof of citizenship. This bill qualifies as nothing more than a 21st century poll tax, which is unconstitutional.

The malicious intent of this law was recently acknowledged in Missouri when a State judge ruled it an impermissible additional qualification to vote and in violation of the State constitution. It would have disenfranchised over 170,000 voters.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this bill is nothing more than a sham and fraudulent. In Missouri, for instance, we were not able to find any cases of vote fraud over the last 50 years. So would the proponents tell me where the fraud comes in?

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have great respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but I can't for the life of me figure out why they oppose making sure that the

people who vote in this country are American citizens.

We have 12 million illegal aliens in this country, and we all know that there have been phony Social Security cards purchased and other documents purchased, and, as a result, these people have been getting benefits from this country, and many of them, we believe, have been voting illegally.

The Constitution, as the minority leader said a while ago, guarantees the rights of American citizens to be able to vote, and the Constitution is supposed to protect the rights of American citizens. She talked about the oath of office that we took to protect the rights of the citizens of this country, and one of those rights is the right to make sure that their vote counts. And if you have illegal voting taking place, then every illegal vote takes away the right of one American's vote to count in that election. And you have to guarantee that right, that the American's vote is going to count. Now, how do you do that?

We know that there has been fraudulent voting in the past. I know some of my colleagues have said that hasn't taken place, but we know it has happened. So with all the illegal aliens coming into this country, all the border security problems that we have had, how do you guarantee that only Americans have the right to vote? You have to have some kind of an identification mechanism.

Now, one of the arguments that was made a while ago was that, well, some people cannot afford it. This bill provides that anybody who cannot afford this documentation, the government will pay for it. The State and the Federal Government will pay for it. So the fact of the matter is there are guarantees that people's right to vote, even if they cannot afford an ID card, will be taken care of.

Now, I have listened to all the arguments. I have heard of all the things that were said by my colleagues on the other side, and I have great respect for them and their opinions. But the fact of the matter is this boils down to whether or not Americans should have their vote counted and not negated by an illegal alien or somebody else who comes into this country who has phony documentation. And that is why a photo ID is very, very important, and other documentation, which will be worked out by my chairman here when it goes to conference.

This is very important for every American citizen, especially if they are concerned about the problem of illegal aliens and border security and their right to vote.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. BURTON, you are speaking about an immigration bill at this point; so perhaps you should get that bill out.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the great gentleman who walks in the footsteps of his great father, the Honorable CHARLES GONZALEZ.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me 1 minute.

The only thing phony about documentation, it is not the documentation, it is the phony argument that is being advanced today.

And I am going to ask the authors, the sponsors, and those individuals that espouse and support this bill to please stand at this time if you were asked at any time in seeking your office that you hold today for documentation such as a passport or a birth certificate to seek this office.

The answer is no. All you did was what we all do. We attest that we are citizens of this great Nation. And guess what? You get your name on the ballot. But when it comes to the voters, we are going to say that is not enough. Give us a passport. Give us a birth certificate. Prove it to us. We may hold the office. You can vote for us. But lo and behold, you cannot vote.

Think of the pure idiocy of the law that is being proposed today. And the reason that it fails on logic, it was never meant to be logical. It was meant to be political. And that is what we have here today.

And I am asking you to give up this charade. Give up November 7, 2006, politics and do the right thing and vote this down.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to a great leader from the great State of California, the Honorable SAM FARR.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

The first thing you learn when you are elected to be a lawmaker is not to pass laws that you can't enforce.

Why is this a bad bill? Because it cannot be enforced. What is in your wallet that shows you are a citizen? None of the people sitting here watching, listening has anything in their wallet that shows they are a citizen of the United States.

This bill requires proof of United States citizenship. How are you going to prove it? Your driver's license? You don't have to be a citizen to have a driver's license. Your Social Security card? You don't have to be a citizen to have a Social Security card. What is in your wallet that shows you are a citizen? You don't have it. You don't have it. So what this bill says is we distrust most the people we asked to create a government.

Members of Congress couldn't even qualify because they do not have cards in their wallet that shows they are a citizen. They can say, "I have got my voting card." Yes. Well, there are 435 of those. How many people in the United States recognize a congressional voting card? You can't even show it in the airport and get by.

So this bill is not enforceable because there is no proof of citizenship card in the United States, which this

bill requires. You shouldn't enact a bad bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to another great leader out of the State of Texas, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me offer my great appreciation to JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I cannot think of a Member of this House who has been so persistent on these issues.

But I do want to say to the American people that we understand that we want to secure the vote, but you might note and might want to understand that out of 197 million people that have voted since 2002, there have only been 52 voter fraud cases.

I want to join you in stamping out voter fraud. I want to make sure that we have one vote/one person. But I do not want to step on the Constitution.

This legislation steps on your rights, one vote/one person. And for every 1 percent of the electorate who does not have the necessary documentation, where you were born with a midwife, you have lost your documents, you were in Hurricane Katrina or a volcano or an earthquake or a mudslide, 2 million voters will be disenfranchised. And, my good friends, this is a 21st century poll tax.

I will include in the RECORD "The Long Shadows of Jim Crow" because this is voter intimidation.

THE LONG SHADOW OF JIM CROW: VOTER INTIMIDATION AND SUPPRESSION IN AMERICA TODAY

OVERVIEW

In a nation where children are taught in grade school that every citizen has the right to vote, it would be comforting to think that the last vestiges of voter intimidation, oppression and suppression were swept away by the passage and subsequent enforcement of the historic Voting Rights Act of 1965. It would be good to know that voters are no longer turned away from the polls based on their race, never knowingly misdirected, misinformed, deceived or threatened.

Unfortunately, it would be a grave mistake to believe it.

In every national American election since Reconstruction, every election since the Voting Rights Act passed in 1965, voters—particularly African American voters and other minorities—have faced calculated and determined efforts at intimidation and suppression. The bloody days of violence and retribution following the Civil War and Reconstruction are gone. The poll taxes, literacy tests and physical violence of the Jim Crow era have disappeared. Today, more subtle, cynical and creative tactics have taken their place.

RACE-BASED TARGETING

Here are a few examples of recent incidents in which groups of voters have been singled out on the basis of race:

Most recently, controversy has erupted over the use in the Orlando area of armed, plainclothes officers from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) to

question elderly black voters in their homes. The incidents were part of a state investigation of voting irregularities in the city's March 2003 mayoral election. Critics have charged that the tactics used by the FDLE have intimidated black voters, which could suppress their turnout in this year's elections. Six members of Congress recently called on Attorney General John Ashcroft to investigate potential civil rights violations in the matter.

This year in Florida, the state ordered the implementation of a "potential felon" purge list to remove voters from the rolls, in a disturbing echo of the infamous 2000 purge, which removed thousands of eligible voters, primarily African-Americans, from the rolls. The state abandoned the plan after news media investigations revealed that the 2004 list also included thousands of people who were eligible to vote, and heavily targeted African-Americans while virtually ignoring Hispanic voters.

This summer, Michigan State Representative John Pappageorge (R-Troy) was quoted in the Detroit Free Press as saying, "If we do not suppress the Detroit vote, we're going to have a tough time in this election." African Americans comprise 83 percent of Detroit's population.

In South Dakota's June 2004 primary, Native American voters were prevented from voting after they were challenged to provide photo IDs, which they were not required to present under State or Federal law.

In Kentucky in July 2004, Black Republican officials joined to ask their State GOP party chairman to renounce plans to place "vote challengers" in African-American precincts during the coming elections.

Earlier this year in Texas, a local district attorney claimed that students at a majority Black college were not eligible to vote in the county where the school is located. It happened in Waller County—the same county where 26 years earlier, a Federal court order was required to prevent discrimination against the students.

In 2003 in Philadelphia, voters in African-American areas were systematically challenged by men carrying clipboards, driving a fleet of some 300 sedans with magnetic signs designed to look like law enforcement insignia.

In 2002 in Louisiana, flyers were distributed in African-American communities telling voters they could go to the polls on Tuesday, December 10—three days after a Senate runoff election was actually held.

In 1998 in South Carolina, a State representative mailed 3,000 brochures to African-American neighborhoods, claiming that law enforcement agents would be "working" the election, and warning voters that "this election is not worth going to jail."

RECENT STRATEGIES

As this report details, voter intimidation and suppression is not a problem limited to the southern United States. It takes place from California to New York, Texas to Illinois. It is not the province of a single political party, although patterns of intimidation have changed as the party allegiances of minority communities have changed over the years.

In recent years, many minority communities have tended to align with the Democratic Party. Over the past two decades, the Republican Party has launched a series of "ballot security" and "voter integrity" initiatives which have targeted minority communities. At least three times, these initiatives were successfully challenged in Federal courts as illegal attempts to suppress voter participation based on race.

The first was a 1981 case in New Jersey which protested the use of armed guards to

challenge Hispanic and African-American voters, and exposed a scheme to disqualify voters using mass mailings of outdated voter lists. The case resulted in a consent decree prohibiting efforts to target voters by race.

Six years later, similar "ballot security" efforts were launched against minority voters in Louisiana, Georgia, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Indiana. Republican National Committee documents said the Louisiana program alone would "eliminate at least 60-80,000 folks from the rolls," again drawing a court settlement.

And just three years later in North Carolina, the State Republican Party, the Helms for Senate Committee and others sent postcards to 125,000 voters, 97 percent of whom were African-American, giving them false information about voter eligibility and warning of criminal penalties for voter fraud—again resulting in a decree against the use of race to target voters.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

This report includes detailed accounts of the recent incidents listed above, and additional incidents from the past few decades. The report also lays out a historical review of more than 100 years of efforts to suppress and intimidate minority voters following emancipation, through Reconstruction and the "Second Reconstruction," the years immediately following the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was among the crowning achievements of the civil rights era, and a defining moment for social justice and equality. The stories of the men and women who were willing to lay down their lives for the full rights of citizenship, including first and foremost the right to vote, are the stuff of history.

Their accomplishments can never be erased. Yet as this report details, attempts to erode and undermine those victories have never ceased. Voter intimidation is not a relic of the past, but a pervasive strategy used with disturbing frequency in recent years. Sustaining the bright promise of the civil rights era, and maintaining the dream of equal voting rights for every citizen requires constant vigilance, courageous leadership, and an active, committed and well-informed citizenry.

THE CHALLENGES OF THE 2004 ELECTION AND BEYOND

The election problems in Florida and elsewhere that led to the disenfranchisement of some four million American voters in the 2000 elections cast a harsh spotlight on flaws in our voting system, problems that involved both illegal actions and incompetence by public officials, as well as outdated machines and inadequate voter education. As election officials nationwide struggle to put new voting technology into place, redesign confusing ballots and educate voters, the opportunities for voter intimidation and suppression have proliferated along with opportunities for disenfranchisement caused by voter confusion and technical problems.

With widespread predictions of a close national election, and an unprecedented wave of new voter registration, unscrupulous political operatives will look for any advantage, including suppression and intimidation efforts. As in the past, minority voters and low-income populations will be the most likely targets of dirty tricks at the polls.

Voter Intimidation in Recent Years

Voter intimidation and suppression efforts have not been limited to a single party, but have in fact shifted over time as voting allegiances have shifted. In recent decades, African American voters have largely been loyal to the Democratic Party, resulting in the prevalence of Republican efforts to suppress

minority turnout. Those efforts have also been extended in recent years to Latino communities.

During the 2003 mayoral election in Philadelphia, fully seven percent of a poll of 1000 African American voters described troubling experiences at the polls. Men with clipboards bearing official-looking insignia were reported at many precincts in African American neighborhoods.

Tom Lindenfeld, who ran the counter-intimidation campaign for Democratic candidate John Street, said this deployment included a fleet of 300 cars that featured decals closely resembling those of federal law enforcement agencies, such as the Drug Enforcement Agency and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Many prospective voters reported being challenged for identification by such workers. Lindenfeld told reporters from the American Prospect that "What occurred in Philadelphia was much more expansive and expensive than anything I'd seen before, and I'd seen a lot."

In fact, the scope of such efforts during the past two decades is startling. Based primarily on reports gleaned from newspapers across the nation, there have been documented instances of the following:

Challenges and threats against individual voters at the polls by armed private guards, off-duty law enforcement officers, local creditors, fake poll monitors, and poll workers and managers.

Signs posted at the polling place warning of penalties for "voter fraud" or "noncitizen" voting, or illegally urging support for a candidate.

Poll workers "helping" voters fill out their ballots, and instructing them on how to vote.

Criminal tampering with voter registration rolls and records.

Fliers and radio ads containing false information about where, when and how to vote, voter eligibility, and the false threat of penalties.

Internal memos from party officials in which the explicit goal of suppressing black voter turnout is outlined.

A Republican effort in New Jersey in 1981 provided a model that was repeated across the country in the last two decades. The Republican National Committee and the New Jersey Republican State Committee engaged in a "concerted effort to threaten and harass black and Hispanic voters" via a "ballot security" effort. It involved widespread challenging of individual voters and an Election Day presence at African American and Latino precincts featuring armed guards and dire warnings of criminal penalties for voting offenses. A legal challenge eventually led to a court order and an agreement by the GOP groups not to employ such intimidation tactics.

But such tactics persist.

□ 1500

This is voter intimidation. And this intimidation cannot stand. This is a bad bill. It is not about those who are not documented, it is about you, America. You will be prevented from the right to vote with this bill. We should defeat it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am the person from Florida where in the 2000 election,

27,000 votes was thrown out in my precincts, 7, 8, 9 and 10, that are 95 percent Democratic. And they say that President Bush won by 527 votes. But the unique thing is in the primary recently, in every single African American precinct, they sent thousands of Republican ballots, and only hundreds of Democratic ballots.

That is unheard of. In every single precinct they sent thousands of Republican ballots and not sufficient Democratic ballots. Now, that is the stupid, incompetent right trying to disenfranchise those same voters. Let me just say that in the supervisor's office, they carried the equipment home the night before the election.

Where our men and women are dying in Iraq for the right for them to vote, we do not have the right right here in the United States of America. It is a crying shame. Shame on them. Vote down this terrible bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD for yielding me time and her leadership on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4844. It is a shame that this Congress, who just months earlier joined together in a bipartisan effort to renew the Voting Rights Act, would now propose such a divisive piece of legislation that has the potential to disenfranchise millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I witnessed firsthand in my home State, Ohio, the great lengths that people have gone to in order to suppress votes. Now Congress is trying to implement its own brand of voter suppression. I have heard them argue that funds will be provided to allow people to get ID cards. Funds were provided in HAVA to allow the Secretary of State to educate voters, but instead our Secretary of State took \$2.5 million, put his own face on TV in order to lead his own gubernatorial race.

Similar legislation was enacted in Ohio. On September 1, Judge Kathleen O'Malley granted a preliminary injunction that prohibits the enforcement of parts of that Ohio bill that would have allowed poll workers to inquire if a voter is a naturalized citizen and ask for proof. In her ruling, Judge O'Malley stated it was inconsistent with and undermined the purpose of the National Voting Rights Act. I ask each of my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman how many more speakers he does have.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker, then I will close.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I think the question is should we put forward a modicum of effort to keep political machines from stealing elections? Do they? Yes. Yes, they do. Just last year, a judge in the State of Washington ruled that 1,678 fraudulent votes were cast in that election.

As we look at the work of the FBI, we see that their investigation in the city of Milwaukee found 4,500 more votes cast in that election than there were people on the rolls. They found evidence of people voting multiple times, people voting for the deceased, people voting illegally. And we have the example in the State of Georgia where an audit showed that 5,412 votes had been cast by deceased voters. Personally I am tired of constituents of mine telling me that someone else voted for them at the polls. It seems to me that an ID system or showing an identification, a photo ID, will take care of this problem.

How do the American public, how do they react to this? Well, an NBC-Wall Street Journal poll recently found that 81 percent of the American people support requiring a photo ID to vote.

By requiring voters to provide a valid form of identification, we can handicap those trying to undermine the process. We can ensure the sanctity of one person-one vote. And we should not have to deal with a situation where our voters go to the polls and repeatedly tell us, somebody else already voted for me.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard many folks on the floor talking about fraud in our election process. We have heard various speakers talking about getting rid of this alleged fraud. There is no Member on this floor who does not want to get rid of fraud. But, Mr. Speaker, this bill does not address real fraud. This is not a good bill.

We have heard many speakers on the floor today delivering colloquies, trying to see whether or not this will fit or that will fit, when, in essence, this legislation merely does not get to the bottom of the real fraud, the problem of voter suppression.

Mr. Speaker, I will be submitting for the RECORD letters from the National Association of Counties and local election administrators who are objecting to this piece of legislation because they say it imposes a fee on themselves and voters all of whom assert that they cannot afford to comply with this legislation is mandate.

We have heard from the chairman and others on the other side who say that if one cannot pay for the ID, it will be paid for. But what they are doing is establishing an unfunded mandate with this piece of legislation, which is why NACO is objecting to this bill.

We also have heard from the election commissioner and county clerk out of

Fairbury, Nebraska and the administrator of elections from Anderson County, TN. I will submit these letters opposing H.R. 4844 for the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER, the proponents of H.R. 4844 characterize this legislation merely as an administrative protection that it is simple to implement and necessary to prevent fraud. The truth is, H.R. 4844 is a misguided measure that will suppress voter turnout and undermine laws that Congress has already passed to assure all citizens will have a full and equal right to participate.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that HAVA is in place now, which is a bipartisan bill that was passed out of this House with bipartisan support.

To enact this law would be an affront to that bill, to all Americans who take pride in the progress our country has made in extending the franchise to all of its citizens, and to all individuals who take offense to the political manipulation of the majority.

Partisan attempts to burden our Nation with troublesome proof of citizenship requirements are not the direction this Congress or this country should be taking. We know that the States of Georgia and Washington, have already thrown out legislation similar to this one.

Democrats, along with well-intended Republicans, have fought for and won the extension of the Voting Rights Act for eligible Americans. During the last century, our country has expanded the right to vote to millions of Americans with the passage of the 19th amendment, gives which women the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act (VRA) was reauthorized on this floor just a couple of months ago, and we know that the VRA prevented institutional voter suppression. The 26th amendment, which gives 18-years-old the right to vote, is another bill that we have passed. Why should we consider a bill like this that does nothing to address voter suppression? This is an intimidation-type bill. It is a partisan attempt to allow the Republicans to maintain the majority.

I tell you, this bill violates State constitutions and the U.S. Constitution because it disenfranchises citizens who are otherwise qualified to vote. The Democrats will not shirk our responsibility to defend the gains put forth by the bills already on the books. We will not shirk our responsibility to ensure that every eligible American has the right to vote. And we will not let these gains be lost to undocumented allegations of fraud that have not been quantitatively proven and have not proven by any empirical data that reveals this so-called type of fraud is widespread.

The right to vote, Mr. Speaker, is too precious to allow any citizen's vote to be sacrificed by those who would treat it carelessly. I would hope that the other side thinks about this and not vote for this bad bill. This is not a good bill. It does nothing but hamper the American people.

This bill creates a poll tax. I want the American people to know that

Democrats are against all types of voter fraud and we are against your paying a poll tax to be able to vote. So I say to the other side that if you really want integrity, then let's look at these electronic voting machines that voters are worried stiff about because they do not know whether their votes will be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that every Member who really has good intentions of trying to protect the laws that are on the books will vote this legislation down.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,

Washington, DC, September 19, 2006.

Re H.R. 4844, the "Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006"

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of county governments across the nation, I am writing to urge a "NO" vote on H.R. 4844, the "Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006".

This bill would impose a staggering unfunded mandate on states and counties. We fear that it could require county clerks and registrars across the country to take on the major new responsibility and expense of issuing photo voter registration cards that would duplicate the Real ID and existing state driver licenses. These cards would have to be issued to every voter in the nation who does not possess a current U.S. passport. Further, we fear that counties would likely have to issue these cards entirely at their own or at state expense.

While regulations have not yet been issued by the Department of Homeland Security, we are given to understand that federal structures will likely not be in place before the statutory deadline for states to be prepared to issue the Real ID. Even if states do have the capacity by 2010 to issue a Real ID to and confirm the citizenship of every voter, H.R. 4844 creates an incentive for states to separate this function from driver licensing and place it within the existing apparatus of voter registration. States that incorporate the requirements of this law into their Real ID for voter identification purposes would be ineligible for even the weak commitment of funding in H.R. 4844.

H.R. 4844 bars counties from imposing a fee on voters who assert that they cannot pay it. States and/or counties may or may not receive sufficient federal funds to pay these costs depending on annual federal appropriations. Furthermore, we fear that any fee imposed on other voters could be characterized as a poll tax and be subject to challenge in court.

If you have any questions about our position on this or any related issue, please feel free to contact me or Alysoun McLaughlin at amclaughlin@naco.org. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

LARRY E. NAAKE,
Executive Director.

REPRESENTATIVES EHLERS AND MILLENDER-MCDONALD: I wish to express my concern about the voter IDs where we are to provide at no cost to indigent voters. We live in a rural area that a lot of the voters are under poverty level. I do not think the county should have to pay for these. You may be going to reimburse the state for the program, but you know it will come back down

to the counties to do the IDs. If you will fund this for the counties I probably wouldn't have any problem with this, but the way the election is going now it has cost the county more over \$6,500.00 for the primary election than ever before for an election. This is all because of the HAVA regulations. This was not to cost the counties anything. I hate to see what this general election is going to cost me. I did not have any rotations in the primary, but with the general I have a bunch. Just got my proofs for the ballots and had 256 pages for 10 precincts. This is because of all the splits I now need to have because of the consolidations everyone wanted also. I'm sure this election will more than cost me all of the budget of \$26,000.00. You may think this is a drop in the bucket, but for our small area it isn't, since I have never spent more than \$12,800 in any other budget year.

Our county is up against the levy limit now so don't know where this money is going to come from.

Please provide for all of the funding, not just to the state, for these IDs.

Thank you

SANDRA STELLING,
Jefferson County Clerk,
Register of Deeds.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLENDER-MCDONALD: I am vehemently opposed to H.R. 4844. As an election official in Anderson County, TN, I can assure you that the provisions of this legislation will have an adverse affect on many of the people I serve every day.

During my tenure as an election administrator, the trend has been to remove barriers to voting, this bill throws logs in the roadway to exercising the right to vote. The need to prove citizenship has never been required and doing so now will deny voting rights to many who have voted all their adult lives.

Many individuals in our east Tennessee county do not have birth certificates let alone passports—furthermore they do not have the money or the wherewithal to secure either.

You need to know that our voter registration forms require that an individual registering to vote attests to their citizenship when they register and to answer untruthfully subjects that person to prosecution.

What bothers me as much as anything is that the bill has a disproportionate impact on the elderly, the disabled, the poor and ethnic minorities in our county.

Our constitution guarantees the right to vote and this law can potentially affect that basic right.

I urge you to vote against this legislation when it comes before your committee.

JO ANN GARRETT,
Administrator of Elections,
Anderson County, TN.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had more time to respond to all of the erroneous comments that have been made. Some of them may have been pertinent as relating to the original bill as introduced. But I wish all those commenting would have read the amended bill that we have before us now.

There has been much discussion about poll taxes. Absolute nonsense. I would never stand for putting a poll tax on any citizen of this country. There is no poll tax. We specifically provided that the State and the Federal Government will pay for any cost. There is no poll tax in this bill.

Furthermore, it is said the burden falls on the poor. Again, nonsense. We

help the poor. There is no burden on the poor. We assist them by helping them prove citizenship and paying for it. So when they apply for Social Security, when they apply for Medicare, when they apply for prescription drug coverage, they will have proof of citizenship in hand.

□ 1515

This benefits the poor. It benefits those who do not have citizenship, because we help them to prove citizenship and we pay for it.

This bill is designed to cut down fraud. I put the question, Where is the fraud? Several have said, there is no fraud. There is fraud.

In the 2000 election in Philadelphia, they had 103 percent of the voter turnout in one precinct. That is fraud. When you have the number of voters who appeared was greater than the number registered for a district, that is fraud.

Then there is the gubernatorial race in the State of Washington. The final result that judges certified, was that the number of illegal votes cast was over 1,000 percent greater than the margin of victory for the winner of that race. That is fraud. Conclusion: There is fraud in voting in this Nation.

It is time for us to get rid of fraud in voting in this Nation. This bill will make a big step towards doing it. It will not endanger anyone's right to vote. It is not a poll tax. It helps citizens to vote legally.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to explain my opposition to H.R. 4844, the so-called Federal Election Integrity Act. Proponents of this legislation claim to be ensuring the integrity of our election system against voter fraud and voting by noncitizens. That is a goal I share. However, the hastily written legislation threatens the privacy of Oregonians due to the unique nature of our full vote-by-mail system.

I do strongly support the goal of establishing more secure identification for American citizens. That is why I voted in favor of the REAL ID Act. The legislation fulfilled a recommendation made by the bipartisan 9/11 Commission that the federal government set standards for the issuance of driver's licenses. The REAL ID Act established minimum document standards for issuing drivers licenses and limited the issuance of licenses only to those who can prove they are American citizens or are migrants who are legally in the United States. This bill, when fully implemented by 2008, will address many of the concerns about proving citizenship that H.R. 4844 raises.

The problem with H.R. 4844 is not its requirement of proof of citizenship when registering to vote, but its continual requirement to present such proof every time a citizen votes.

In my state we conduct all elections by vote-by-mail. This bill requires citizens voting by mail to submit photocopies of documents proving their citizenship along with their ballot every single time they vote. That means, at least twice a year, the 2.1 million Oregonians registered to vote will have to provide the same photocopied birth certificate, passport, driver's license etc. along with their ballot to

election officials. This extra paperwork creates a big burden for citizens and election officials alike in Oregon. Under the current system in Oregon, election officials match the signature on your ballot with our signature that's on file. That should be sufficient to confirm your identity. Repeatedly submitting photocopied proof of sensitive documents is not necessary.

I also have serious privacy concerns about what is done with the sensitive, personally identifiable information that will be required to be submitted by millions of Oregonians. How long must election officials keep these sensitive documents on file? How should they be disposed of? Who has access to the documents and under what circumstances? How can the information in the documents be used? The bill is silent on these issues.

Further, this bill requires Oregonians to repeatedly submit this personal information despite the lack of evidence of a voting fraud problem in Oregon. According to the Oregon Secretary of State, since 1991, over 10 million votes have been cast in Oregon. Of those 10 million votes, only 10 people have met the criteria that would want an investigation into their citizenship. Of those ten, two have been prosecuted. So the level of fraud in Oregon over the last 15 years has been 1 in 5 million votes, and these two instances were prosecuted. It is important to keep in mind that the penalties for voting fraud are already severe. Immigrants who try to vote are automatically given a one-way ticket home, no criminal conviction is necessary.

If the majority was truly concerned about guaranteeing the integrity of federal elections, we should be focusing on widespread concerns about new electronic voting technology. Concerns and questions over the integrity of these machines have been proven in recent elections. Machines fail, votes are lost, hard drives are damaged. Secure and auditable electronic voting machines that provide a paper ballot for verification should be the focus of Congress, not this hastily written bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4844, the Federal Election Integrity Act.

This legislation would require individuals voting in federal elections to provide photo identification that also shows proof of citizenship in order to vote.

I am extremely concerned that this legislation would disenfranchise many eligible voters and depress voter turnout. Congress and the states should pass measures to increase, not decrease, voter turnout, and to encourage eligible voters to go to the polls.

Studies indicate that illegal voting or voter fraud is extremely rare, and such behavior is already punishable by law. However, we have numerous documented instances of actual problems in our electoral systems which are not addressed by this legislation, such as improper purging of voters from the rolls and distributing false information about when and where to vote. In my own state of Maryland in last Tuesday's primary election, we experienced numerous problems with voters being turned away because of malfunctioning computer voting machines, a lack of provisional paper ballots, and poorly trained or absent poll workers.

This legislation would have a disproportionate impact on economically disadvantaged persons—such as the homeless, the elderly, persons with disabilities, frequent movers, and

other minority groups and persons of color—who are far less likely to have current state-issued identification. Requiring voters to bring identification to the polls will serve as a poll tax for some eligible voters, who can afford neither the cost nor time to obtain a new or duplicate drivers' license, passport, or birth certificate. The bill contains weak provisions to reimburse states that cover the cost of issuing identifications to indigent individuals. Indeed, Congress has yet to fully fund implementation of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002, passed after the 2000 presidential election which disenfranchised many eligible voters.

Finally, proof of citizenship requirements will severely hamper the ability of nonpartisan organizations to conduct voter registration campaigns within minority communities, by limiting what documents can be accepted as valid identification for the purpose of registration.

I note that several leading voting rights groups have opposed this legislation, including the NAACP, League of Women Voters, and the U.S. Public Research Interest Group. The AARP has also opposed this legislation, which may disenfranchise older Americans.

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the National Association of Counties (NACO) also oppose this legislation. NCSL wrote that this "ill-advised bill . . . places a potentially huge unfunded mandate on states . . . and would preempt current states' voter identification requirements."

Just a few months ago I was pleased to cosponsor and vote for legislation to reauthorize the historic Voting Rights Act of 1965 for another 25 years. Discrimination and prejudice still exist against minority voters, in addition to disenfranchisement at the polls caused by faulty equipment or poorly trained poll workers. We must redouble our efforts to make sure that every eligible vote is counted, and that this democracy does not continue to shamefully turn away eligible voters at the polls.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4844, the Federal Election Integrity Act.

Since the passage of the Help America Vote Act, this body—led by the Committee on House Administration on which I proudly serve—has paid careful attention to our electoral process and has considered several recommendations on how we can improve the way we vote.

One such recommendation came from the bipartisan Commission on Federal Election Reform which was headed by Former President Jimmy Carter and Former Secretary of State James Baker and recommended that in order to deter and detect voter fraud, we should require photo IDs at the polls.

In this day and age, it is shocking that we still do not verify U.S. citizenship when people vote. Motor-voter laws have allowed driver's license applicants to simply check a box to register to vote regardless of whether they are a U.S. citizen.

This loophole has facilitated the many instances of non-citizen voting that I we have heard about today.

While there may be disputes about the nature and extent of voter fraud, there can be no dispute that it occurs. In close elections even a small amount of fraud can affect the outcome. Do we really want foreigners to cast the deciding votes in our elections?

When an illegal immigrant casts an illegal vote he does more than break the law. He is

canceling out a legal vote and robbing Americans of our constitutional right to be heard in an election.

The Federal Election Integrity Act that we are debating today can help restore integrity to our elections.

Requiring individuals who vote in a Federal election to provide proof that they are a United States citizen will help prevent voter fraud—plain and simple. It is the best way to ensure the utmost accuracy in realizing the will of the American people.

In short, requiring a photo ID is the best way to make sure that only U.S. citizens are casting ballots.

Contrary to what the critics would have you believe, this isn't a radical idea. Showing proof of identification and citizenship is warranted and commonplace in today's society.

Individuals are required to have photo identification to engage in routine activities such as boarding an airplane, entering a government building, purchasing cigarettes and cashing a check. Our voting system deserves at least as much protection as these other activities.

Democrats have argued that this bill will disproportionately affect racial minorities and have even alleged that this is one of the motives behind our Republican Leadership bringing this bill to the floor today. These claims are outrageous and unsubstantiated—voter fraud affects us all.

In fact, under this bill states must provide the necessary photo ID free of charge to individuals who cannot afford to pay. This bill is simply about protecting the will of all Americans.

When an illegal vote is cast, an American citizen with the constitutional right to have his vote counted becomes disenfranchised, regardless of race.

When voting, our citizens should be able to trust that the system will honor their voice and reveal the will of the American people. I urge all my colleagues to join me in protecting the rights of every American by supporting the Federal Election Integrity Act.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to object strongly to the voter disenfranchisement proposal before us.

According to the Election Assistance Commission's comprehensive Survey of the 2004 election, there were more than 197 million voting-age American citizens at that time. According to the Brennan Center for Justice in its September 2006 voter identification study, as many as 10% of eligible voters do not have, and maybe will not get, the documents required by strict voter ID laws. Thus, the very first thing this bill will do is disenfranchise as many as 20 million eligible voters.

Who are these 20 million voters? The poor. The elderly. The disabled. Persons of color. Native Americans. Students. Why would anyone vote in favor of disenfranchising these citizens?

The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) was an imperfect bill, but it did reach a bipartisan compromise on voter identification. HAVA's already-existing requirements for voter identification and the integrity of voter registration rolls go on for pages. Among the requirements:

States must make "a reasonable effort to remove registrants who are ineligible to vote from the official list of eligible voters;"

Voter registration applications may not be "accepted or processed" unless they include

an applicants driver's license number or, in the case of voters who don't have one, "the last 4 digits of the applicants Social Security number;" or, in the case of voters with neither, a "unique identifying number" assigned by election officials;

First time voters who registered by mail and did not present ID must show photo ID at the polls when they vote.

Voters can't get around that requirement by voting absentee—first time voters who registered by mail and did not present ID must send a copy of a photo ID with their mail-in ballot.

And HAVA provides for criminal penalties for violations for the foregoing—"any individual who knowingly commits fraud or knowingly makes a false statement with respect to the naturalization, citizenry, or alien registry of such citizen . . . shall be fined, imprisoned [for up to five years], or both."

The measure before us is a solution in search of a problem. The Department of Justice (DOJ), in its "Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity for 2004," reported that at the end of 2004, the Public Integrity Section had approximately 133 election crime matters pending nationwide. That is an average of just over two cases per state for the entire year—hardly an avalanche. In addition, most of the cases described in the report concerned campaign finance violations, not voter fraud. Only one described a vote-buying scheme, and none referred specifically to non-citizen or double voting. On the other hand, the same Report noted that a total of 1,213 public officials had been charged with corruption in 2004, that 1,020 of them had been convicted of corruption, and that 419 cases remained pending. In other words, according to the DOJ's own findings, the problem of corruption among public official is at the very least ten times worse than the problem of citizens cheating in elections.

Meanwhile, other studies have found that instances of double voting and voting using another's identity are virtually non-existent.

Washington State—a study of 2.8 million ballots cast in 2004 showed that only 0.0009 percent of them reflected double voting or voting in the name of deceased individuals.

Ohio—a statewide survey found a mere four instances out of more than 9 million votes cast where ineligible persons voted or attempting to vote in 2002 and 2004—a rate of 0.00004%.

Georgia—which recently passed one of the strictest voter ID laws, which was subsequently struck down); Secretary of State Cathy Cox stated that in her ten-year tenure, she could not recall one documented case of voter fraud involving the impersonation of a registered voter at the polls.

I have introduced legislation, the Electoral Fairness Act of 2006 (H.R. 4989), that would require that all voters, upon being duly registered, be issued a durable voter registration card at no cost to the voter, "which shall serve as proof that the individual is duly registered to vote" at the polling place which services the individual's address. The bill would preserve HAVA's existing voter ID requirements, but add no more, an the voter registration cards would serve strictly to protect voters who are removed from the voter rolls wrongfully or erroneously.

My legislation would protect the 1.2 million voters who were, in fact, wrongfully denied access to a regular ballot in 2004 when they

showed up at polling places. The legislation before us, in the absence of meaningful or documented justification, would leave those 1.2 million voters in jeopardy of wrongful disenfranchisement and add 20 million more to the pile. In the name of solving a problem that is evidently a tiny problem these legislators—at great expense to individuals and to states—would add requirements that will turn away legitimate, deserving, honest voters. This is poll tax, pure and simple, and I urge my colleagues to vote it down.

GROUPS OPPOSING H.R. 4844

A. Philip Randolph Institute; ACORN; Advancement Project; Aguila Youth Leadership Institute; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Association of People with Disabilities; American Association of Retired Persons (AARP); American Civil Liberties Union; American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona; American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL—CIO); American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; American Immigration Lawyers Association; American Policy Center; Americans for Democratic Action; Arizona Advocacy Network; Arizona Consumers Council; Arizona Hispanic Community Forum; Arizona Students' Association; Asian American Justice Center; Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund; Asian and Pacific Islander American Vote (APIAVote); and Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL—CIO.

Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law; Center for Digital Democracy; Common Cause; Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility; Concerned Foreign Service Officers; Congressional Hispanic Caucus; Consumer Action; Cyber Privacy Project; Democratic Women's Working Group; Demos: A Network for Ideas & Action; Electronic Privacy Information Center; Emigrantes Sin Fronteras; Fairfax County Privacy Council; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic National Bar Association; Interfaith Worker Justice of Arizona; Intertribal Council of Arizona; Japanese American Citizens League (JACL); La Union Del Pueblo Entero (LUPE); Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; and Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; League of United Latin American Citizens; League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson; League of Women Voters of the United States; Legal Momentum; Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Educational Fund; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Congress of American Indians; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza; National Disability Rights Network; National Education Association; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium; National Urban League; National Voting Rights Institute; Navajo Nation; New York Public Interest Research Group, Inc./NYPIRG; Ohio Taxpayers Association & OTA Foundation; People for the American Way Foundation; and Project for Arizona's Future.

Protection and Advocacy System; RainbowPUSH Coalition; Republican Liberty Caucus; SEIU Local 5 Arizona; Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF); Somos America/We Are America; Southwest Voter Registration Education Project; The Multiracial Activist; The Rutherford Institute; Tohono O'odham Nation; Transgender Law Center; U.S. PIRG; Uni-

tarian Universalist Association of Congregations; United Auto Workers; United Church of Christ Justice & Witness Ministries; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; United States Student Association; United Steelworkers; UNITE—HERE; Velvet Revolution; William C. Velasquez Institute; and YWCA USA.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support ensuring that only American citizens vote in our Nation's elections. The right to vote of all Americans is diminished if ineligible and illegal votes are cast. That is the goal and intent of this bill, which is why I vote to move this bill forward today.

There are provisions of the bill, however, that have me greatly concerned about the impact it would have on Washington state voters who are required to vote by mail. The bill would mandate that voters photocopy their driver's license and mail that copy in with their ballot. This places a heavier burden on mail voters than poll voters. It creates a higher hurdle for mail voters to get their vote counted. And it raises serious questions about personal privacy and the potential for identity theft. These requirements are not acceptable and must be addressed during any conference committee talks with the Senate.

Chairman EHLERS has given his assurance that the mail voting provisions will be addressed in a conference, and specifically that the views of Washington's Secretary of State will be heard. I appreciate this commitment and believe there are certainly far less burdensome ways to ensure only citizens are casting mail-in ballots.

Clearly, Washington and Oregon stand out among other states when it comes to voting by mail and federal law must respect differences among the fifty states.

Action needs to be taken to ensure only citizens are casting ballots in elections and that is why I vote to move this bill forward today, but I will oppose and vote against any final bill or conference report if my concerns on the mail voting requirements are not addressed.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4844, the so-called Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006. Beginning in 2008, this bill imposes a requirement that eligible voters must present a government-issued photo identification and beginning in 2010, eligible voters must present a government-issued photo identification that would prove they are a citizen.

Proponents of this bill claim that requiring a photo identification and proof of citizenship to vote will combat voter fraud. But, too often, anecdotal stories are put forth as evidence to prove the claim they are using to make the case for this bill. However, there is no concrete evidence to back up the need for this proposal. According to Demos and People for the American Way, to date there have been no major studies to document actual election fraud in the United States. Furthermore, according to the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, nationally since October 2002, only "86 individuals have been convicted of federal crimes relating to election fraud, while 196,139,871 ballots have been cast in federal general elections." There needs to be more safeguards to protect the integrity of the electoral process, but this can only be done by addressing actual problems that are currently undermining voting rights, almost all of which have the effect of disenfranchising eligible voters. The bill doesn't address voter intimidation

and discrimination at the polls and it doesn't take into account the costs to states to implement the requirements of H.R. 4844, making it an unfunded mandate.

This bill is not just guilty of being a solution in search of problem. It actually will create a problem. The real impact of this bill will undoubtedly be an increase in voter disenfranchisement, because the burden and cost involved in obtaining the identification required would likely discourage many Americans from voting, an essential Constitutional right. Also, even though H.R. 4844 has a provision that requires states to give free photo identification to those who cannot afford them, it does not take into account the time and cost that eligible voters would incur to get the supporting documents needed to obtain this required identification. Essentially this forces people to pay for their Constitutionally guaranteed right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the burden that this legislation creates falls squarely on the shoulders of seniors, and the disabled. The AARP is strongly opposed to this bill because of the disproportionate impact it has on seniors. Many seniors no longer drive and therefore do not have a driver's license, many were born at home by midwives and do not have a birth certificate, and have limited mobility, making it extremely difficult for them to obtain a government-issued identification to meet this bill's requirements. Even those who wish to vote by provisional ballot are required to present the required identification for their vote to be counted.

Elections should be open to all eligible voters and as Members of Congress we should be enacting legislation that encourages more Americans to vote, not erecting new barriers to voting. Laws such as the groundbreaking Voting Rights Act of 1965 were enacted to create a more inclusive democracy by making voting easier. H.R. 4844 will seriously undermine that goal and will be a disservice to the memories of those courageous civil rights heroes who fought for its implementation.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4844.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, three months ago we stood on this floor debating the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act (H.R. 9) in an effort to make sure elections are fair, that every vote is counted, and that people have equal access to the polls. Yet today we are faced with the Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006 (HR 4844) which would directly disenfranchise people of color, rural voters, young people, low-income people, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities.

At a time of decreased voter participation, it seems unwarranted to impose extraneous burdens on eligible citizens who want to participate in the democratic process. The identification requirements imposed by this legislation serve as a strong reminder of the poll taxes imposed by many Southern states in the 1950s to prevent poor and black Americans from voting.

According to the Department of Transportation, currently 6–12 percent of eligible voters do not have the proper identification mandated by this legislation. Acquiring the required documents places a huge time and financial burden on those least able to afford. For instance, a U.S. passport costs approximately \$85, while replacing naturalization documents can cost up to \$210.

This legislation creates an outrageous burden on my state of Oregon. In 1998, Oregon voters passed an initiative requiring that all elections be conducted by mail. Should this bill pass, our voters would be required to photocopy their identification every time they wanted to vote which further hampers the accessibility to vote by mail. As for voter fraud, during the last 15 years of general elections over 10 million votes have been cast by Oregon voters and yet only 10 people have met the criteria to warrant an investigation.

This legislation discourages voter participation, many who continue to lose confidence in our electoral system, while enabling voter discrimination in select communities. Overall, this legislation tries to create a solution to a voter fraud problem regarding voter identification that does not exist, while overlooking obvious and real problems.

Just last week during Maryland's primary elections many voters were delayed or turned away. In one county computer cards were not delivered to precinct workers while in another computers incorrectly read party affiliation and could not be tabulated.

Anyone who examined what happened in Ohio last election cycle, including voting problems and potential abuse due to the underfunded and ill-thought-out congressional meddling, must wonder what will happen in the 2008 election.

Every American should be alarmed and outraged by Congress indulging in partisan political shenanigans regarding elections rather than implementing long overdue protections for the integrity of the ballot box.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Voter ID Act.

Sensing electoral defeat in the fall, the Republicans have done what they always do—act desperate and deflect attention.

Mandating voter IDs to prove citizenship will do nothing to protect our homeland security, make the voting process more secure, insure every vote is counted or keep non-citizens from voting.

News flash to my colleagues, the fear that non-citizens may vote is not what is keeping my constituents up at night.

Completing the war on terror, finding Osama bin Laden, bringing our troops home, and figuring out how to pay for their kids college education are the issues my constituents care about.

Not passing a not-needed bill for a total non issue.

Today, we are mandating citizenship IDs at the polling places, in a voter disenfranchisement act that would make Bull Connor smile from below.

The Republicans continue to place all the blame on immigrants instead of accepting the blame themselves that they dropped the ball on comprehensive immigration reform, they dropped the ball on homeland security by underfunding our ports and border security and they dropped the ball on the war on terror.

There is a problem at the ballot box, but it isn't illegal immigrants voting. The problem is that American citizens aren't voting.

Instead of promoting voter participation, this bill creates disincentives.

Instead of encouraging voter participation by all Americans, we are adding roadblocks.

Instead of building one America, we are creating a divisive America.

This is a solution in search of a problem.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, while this bill is entitled the Federal Election Integrity Act, that is highly deceptive. Make no mistake; there is no integrity in trying to deny thousands of legal voters their right to vote.

Voting is a sacred right. A right that, unfortunately, seems to be under attack in this Congress. It was barely two months ago that this body voted on a bipartisan basis to reauthorize crucial provisions of the Voting Rights Act—the nation's most effective mechanism for protecting minority voting rights. But now, as we debate H.R. 4844, that vote seems disingenuous. H.R. 4844 is a misguided approach that would add unnecessary obstacles to the voting process. Congress should not be in the practice of disenfranchising voters under the guise of protecting the right to vote. Unfortunately, that's precisely what this bill would do.

This legislation is quite likely to be struck down by the Supreme Court. As recently as yesterday, state photo ID laws were found to be unconstitutional. This is because photo ID laws disproportionately affect racial and ethnic minorities, the elderly, people with disabilities, rural voters, students, the homeless, low-income people, and frequent movers.

Many of our constituents would be at risk of not being able to vote because they do not have the time, money or ability to obtain their birth certificates or their passports. And let us not forget the hundreds of thousands of Hurricane Katrina victims, now dispersed across the country, who lost their birth certificates in the muddy waters left by the hurricane.

Since consideration of this bill began, many of our colleagues have shared their own personal stories of not being able to obtain their birth certificates, or being turned away at the voting booth. The same is true for one of my constituents in Sacramento who contacted me because he was experiencing difficulty proving he was an American citizen. Adopted as a child by a member of the Armed Forces, the crux of the problem centered around the fact that his adopted father was born in the south and did not have a birth certificate. If this legislation were in place, my constituent may have been turned away at the polls. That is unforgivable and it is unconstitutional. I am sure this is just one example of many.

What's even more alarming is that we are debating a bill that seeks to rectify a problem that hardly exists. Worse still, there are already laws on the books to address this very issue. Instead of just enforcing those laws, this bill is an attempt to scare voters by inferring that illegal immigrants and others in our country are misrepresenting their identity when they go to vote. The truth is that there is little proof of that.

What we do have proof of are the problems with our voting system. That's what Congress should be working on now. We need to be working on laws that ensure that our voting machines are not susceptible to tampering and that those machines have a paper trail—laws that ensure every vote is counted.

That is what my constituents are writing to me in the hundreds about. They are distrustful of the voting machines and with good reason. Just last week, a professor at Princeton hacked into a Diebold e-voting machine. Clearly our voting machines are vulnerable to malicious attacks and potential voter fraud.

Rather than address these serious concerns before a major election, this Congress has decided to take up a bill that seeks to limit the rights of legal voters. Congress must work on ways to encourage voter participation, not create undue obstacles to vote. I urge Members to vote against this denial of voting rights.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4844.

I am a strong supporter of re-establishing the integrity of our elections. The last 6 years have exposed serious flaws in the way we conduct elections.

We use electronic forms of voting that cannot be audited, there is no verification system in place and we all remember the month that this country stood still while we tried to figure out who won the Presidential election in 2000.

In the countless election problems this country has seen recently, none of them were because of voting by non-citizens.

H.R. 4844 would require voters to present government-issued I.D. in order to vote. Currently, that document is a U.S. Passport. Aside from the impact this would have on minority voters, this will also impact the elderly.

Under the bill, mail-in ballots would have to include a photo copy of an ID proving that you are a citizen. Currently, that document is a U.S. passport.

Seventy-five percent of Americans don't have a passport and many of the senior citizens in my district don't have the resources to pay \$97 dollars to get a passport.

Forcing Americans to spend their hard earned money to get a passport or some other form of identification in order to vote sounds a lot like a poll-tax.

Finally, it is already illegal to vote if you are not a citizen. State and local officials are already able to enforce these laws. Secretaries of State and County Clerks have the authority to remove ineligible voters from the rolls to prevent voter fraud.

This system works and there is no need for this legislation.

If we want to address election integrity, let's talk about providing a paper-trail and having audits of election returns so we can ensure every vote is counted come election day.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 484.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that during the 40th Anniversary of the historic passage of the Voting Rights Act, that anyone could propose mandating nationwide photo ID requirements. Given the cost, difficulty and bureaucracy involved in obtaining photo ID for many minorities, elderly, and indigent, the idea of a national voter ID and proof of citizenship requirement amounts to nothing less than a 21st Century Poll Tax, that could disenfranchise as many as 20 million American voters.

A NATIONAL VOTER ID REQUIREMENT WILL OPERATE AS
A POLL TAX

We all know that the States will never fund an unfunded mandate, and even if they do, for many Americans it will be quite difficult, extensive, and time consuming to obtain the requisite ID cards. Georgia, which just enacted a new voter ID requirement did not even bother to provide an office in Atlanta.

Data developed during the debate over the Georgia voter ID bill indicated that 36 percent of Georgians over the age of 75 do not have a driver's license and that African-Americans in Georgia are nearly five times less likely

than whites to have access to a motor vehicle and thus even to need a driver's license.

Moreover, in Georgia, residents who do not have a driver's license must buy a State ID card to vote, at a cost of \$20 for a five-year card or \$35 for 10 years. For many living on a fixed or low income, \$20 to \$35 is cost-prohibitive. People should not be forced to choose between a bag of groceries, needed medications, or the right to vote.

In addition, the proof of citizenship requirements that are outlined in this bill will place on the voter the difficult, time consuming, and costly burden of obtaining the necessary documentation to prove citizenship in order to cast a ballot.

A NATIONAL VOTER ID AND PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT WILL LEAD TO DISCRIMINATORY IMPLEMENTATION AND WILL DISPROPORTIONATELY BURDEN PEOPLE OF COLOR

There is strong empirical evidence that photo ID requirements disproportionately burden people of color.

In 1994, the Justice Department found that African-Americans in Louisiana were 4 to 5 times less likely to have government-sanctioned photo ID than white residents. As a result, the DoJ denied pre-clearance for that State's proposed photo ID requirement because they found that "it would lead to retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise."

Moreover, in 2001, the Carter-Ford National Commission on Election Reform found that identification provisions at the polls are selectively enforced. Even in places that do not require voters to show ID, poll workers are known to ask certain voters to prove their identity, in many cases demanding ID from minority voters, but not whites.

MANY AMERICANS DO NOT AND WILL NOT HAVE THE REQUISITE STATE-ISSUED PHOTO ID OR PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENTS

In 2005, the Carter-Baker Commission on Federal Election Reform estimated that 10 percent of voting-age Americans do not have a driver's license or a state-issued non-driver's photo ID. That translates into as many as 20 million eligible voters who will not be allowed to vote on Election Day.

Moreover, proof of citizenship requirements, such as the one proposed in this bill, are impossible for members of some communities to acquire and very hard for others. It is widely known that in certain parts of the country, elderly African-Americans and many Native Americans were born at home, under the care of midwives, and do not possess birth certificates. People of color, people with disabilities, the elderly, and low-income citizens are among the demographic groups least likely to have documents in their possession to prove citizenship.

Further, for victims of natural disasters like hurricanes Katrina and Rita, it may be impossible to obtain birth certificates or other documents because they have been destroyed.

AN ID CARD SYSTEM WILL LEAD TO A SLIPPERY SLOPE OF SURVEILLANCE AND CITIZEN MONITORING

A national voter ID card system would significantly diminish freedom and privacy in the U.S. because once put in place, it is unlikely that such a system would be restricted to its original purpose. A national voter ID system would threaten the privacy that Americans have always enjoyed and will gradually increase the control that government and business wields over everyday citizens.

CONCLUSION

We all want clean elections. But that is not what legislation like H.R. 4844 will accomplish. A federally mandated voter ID and proof of citizenship requirement will make it harder for people to vote, and not just people generally, but lawfully registered voters who happen to be seniors, young people, living in cities, lower-income and minorities. That is an effect clearly at odds with our most fundamental values as Americans.

Voting is an invaluable right—the one that guards all of our other rights and ensures every American an opportunity to participate in our democracy. We must do everything in our power to make voting easier, not harder, and to resist the imposition of new requirements to vote that do not serve a fair and compelling purpose that actually promotes our democracy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 4844—the so-called "Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006".

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, it almost seems that each day that goes by, this Congress stands idly by while we lose more and more of our fundamental rights.

When there is voter fraud—anywhere, anytime election officials must react immediately to right the problem.

And at every turn in this democracy, we must work to increase what is still an anemic voter turnout in the world's leading democracy.

Where's the problem to solve?

The voting problems in recent mid-Atlantic areas were related to the new electronic devices that neither voters—nor poll workers—were familiar with using.

This bill is not about integrity or reducing voter fraud—it is all about depressing the number of voters in U.S. elections by requiring all citizens to show proof of citizenship in order to vote.

This Congress would have voters show both a driver's license and a birth certificate in order to cast a vote.

Where's your birth certificate?

Ask those you know born in this country—do you know how to put your hands on your birth certificate?

Imagine the difficulty for the elderly, students, the disabled, Native Americans and other minorities in finding that document . . . or perhaps that was imagined when this scheme was conceived.

Members of this House should not fear great numbers of voters in elections—we must encourage it.

Hispanics in South Texas will be profoundly impacted by this legislation.

This bill will suppress turnout and intimidate voters—which is a slap in the face of democracy and our Constitution.

Millions of Americans will be denied their right to vote because this Congress is so determined to address a problem that does not really exist.

This bill imposes the 2nd poll tax on voters—through this 2nd unfunded mandate for voting requirements on the states.

Let us not move backwards on this matter.

In my very first election—as Constable in Nueces County, Texas, in 1964—the poll tax was in its final throws . . . but was still the law in Texas.

My mother borrowed against her house to help offset my filing fee . . . and to help my voters pay the poll tax.

Let's not ever see that day again where citizens are taxed in order to vote . . . let's stop putting unfunded mandate on our states . . . and let's seek more ways to increase voting, not suppress it.

We've come too far on civil rights in this Nation to move backwards.

Let us act boldly . . . let us find ways to increase voting in the United States, not suppress it, or tax voters to DE-crease voter turnout.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4844, the wrongly entitled Federal Election Integrity Act. Like so many Republican window dressings, this bill might seem like a no-brainer to some. Only citizens can vote, so why not have them show their ID and prove their address and citizenship to reduce fraud? If only the real world were as simple as country club Republicans imagine.

What about students whose driver's licenses show their home address but who register to vote on campus? Nursing home residents who have been voting for over 50 years but whose documents are nowhere to be found? Low-income Americans who don't drive and have never had a state-issued identification? It's no coincidence that the people who will be disenfranchised by this bill are core Democratic constituencies. Powerful interests have figured out that there are lots of ways to institute a poll tax by another name.

What about reducing voter fraud, something we all support? It will come as no surprise to anyone who has run for office or worked in campaigns that there is little evidence of fraudulent voting. It's hard enough to convince most registered voters to go to the polls. What is the incentive to engage in voter fraud, a felony offense? In particular, there is little incentive for immigrants—against whom this legislation is targeted—to vote illegally. Voter fraud by immigrants is subject to immediate deportation without appeal. Do the sponsors of this bill really believe that thousands, or even tens, of immigrants would risk deportation to cast a single vote?

If anything shatters confidence in our election system, it is the thousands of votes that are not counted because of dimpled chads, electronic voting breakdowns, provisional ballot mishaps, three-hour lines at polling places, and the like. The Help America Vote Act, which was supposed to address some of these problems, has never been fully funded or enforced, and yet the Republican Majority wants to further restrict voting and create a new administrative nightmare for our states and localities.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill, so that all Americans might have the opportunity to cast their vote in November against this desperate cling to power.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4844, the Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006, because it will sacrifice the most fundamental right guaranteed to all American citizens by the Constitution—the right to vote. Contrary to its title, the bill will undermine the integrity of our electoral process by imposing unnecessary barriers to full participation in federal elections. The bill's requirements of proof of citizenship and photo identification as a prerequisite to voting may appear innocuous, but in reality they will create an

unprecedented regime of disenfranchisement aimed at seniors, minority voters, low income voters, students and voters with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill imposes an undue burden on eligible voters. As the United States District Court found last year in *Common Cause v. Billups*, 406 F.Supp.2d 1326 (N.D. Ga. 2005), when considering a Georgia law requiring ID at the polls, “photo identification requirements unconstitutionally burden the fundamental right to vote of eligible American citizens.” The district judge issued an immediate injunction against the law, likening it to a segregation-era poll tax because the digital picture ID would cost voters \$20. The court found that these provisions disproportionately affect traditionally disenfranchised voters, including senior citizens, minority voters, poor voters, disabled voters and young voters.

And the decisions keep coming. A state judge yesterday again rejected the Georgia law requiring voters to show government-issued photo identification, writing in his decision, “This cannot be.” In his ruling, the judge said that the law places too much of a burden on voters, and “Any attempt by the legislature to require more than what is required by the express language of our Constitution cannot withstand judicial scrutiny”. *Lake v. Perdue*, No. CV 119207 (Ga. Super. Ct. Sept. 19, 2006) In Michigan, the photo ID requirement was declared unconstitutional by the State’s attorney general and his decision is now being reviewed by the State Supreme Court. In Pennsylvania, a similar voter ID bill was vetoed by the governor.

Proponents of this bill claim that these draconian constraints are necessary to guard against identity fraud at the Nation’s polling places. The truth, however tells a far different story. According to the United States Department of Justice, out of 196,139,871 votes cast since 2002, only about 80 voters were convicted of federal election fraud. Mr. Speaker, when we compare the number of eligible voters that will be disenfranchised because of this bill to the number of documented cases of fraud, it’s clear that this bill will do more harm than good—the cure is clearly worse than the disease.

Mr. Speaker, it’s hard to believe that the same Congress that reauthorized the Voting Rights Act two months ago could now seriously contemplate passage of this bill. There is plenty that needs to be done to fix our electoral system, but instead of addressing problems that don’t exist, it is our responsibility to ensure that we have a model system of choosing our elected officials—one that exemplifies the true principle of democracy and serves as an example to other nations around the world. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republicans’ National Voter ID act. This bill imposes new Federal ID

requirements on all voters in Federal elections and would have the effect of disenfranchising millions of American citizens. H.R. 4844 requires all States to demand that voters provide government-issued identification in order to vote in the 2008 election, and a copy when voting absentee or by mail, and proof of citizenship in order to vote in the 2010 election.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4844 undoes the progress of the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization enacted just 2 months ago by imposing a 21st century poll tax. This bill would disenfranchise the elderly, people with disabilities, and minorities. The costs of obtaining the documents needed to prove you are citizen are high. A birth certificate usually costs \$1–\$15; and according to the State Department only 27 percent of eligible Americans have passports, which cost \$97. Naturalization papers, if they need to be replaced, cost \$210. While supporters of H.R. 4844 promise to help some citizens who don’t have money to pay for these documents, we cannot bank on the promise from the Republican majority who have refused to honor their commitment to the Help America Vote Act.

Mr. Speaker, let me state clearly that I oppose voter fraud. Currently, there are very strong federal statues on the books to penalize voter fraud and I support their vigorous enforcement. The Help American Vote Act, which I supported, gave States resources to both expand access and prevent voter fraud. Yet, the Republican majority has under-funded the Help American Vote Act by \$800 million. I oppose this legislation, and urge my colleagues to reject this 21st Century poll tax.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 4844, and express my dismay with this distraction. I fear that actions taken today will sear doubt and weakness into one of our treasured and fundamental rights as a democratic Nation.

Not 3 months ago, we dedicated significant amounts of time and resources to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. We celebrated the fact that these rights will be secure for another generation. And yet, with this bill, we are reminded that these rights are fleeting, and must continually be protected.

This bill undermines the very provisions we have been fighting for—and clearly have not yet won—for over 40 years. This bill compounds the disproportionate discrimination that persists across this Nation.

This bill attempts to address a problem that does not exist, and this is crucial to understand. There is no voter fraud problem. It is simply not a documented issue. Suggesting that it may be plays into bigotry and xenophobia.

Data from the U.S. Department of Justice shows that while 196,139,871 votes have been cast in Federal elections since October 2002, only 52 individuals have been convicted of Federal voter fraud. Most of these convictions were for vote buying or for voter registration fraud, neither of which would be prevented by restrictive ill requirements at the polls.

If convicted of voter fraud, an individual can be given up to 5 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine: The Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation has an active—and fully funded—prosecution team to enforce Federal and State election laws.

In reality, the bill is a 21st century poll tax. Instead of money collected at the poll door,

however, the tax will now be collected at the Department of Motor Vehicles. Congress cannot place itself on the wrong side of this debate—history will see this clearly.

The crux of discriminatory measures in this bill rests with the fact that the right to vote is tied to documents that are not readily available. The burden of obtaining these documents—whether the cost of obtaining supporting documentation, investing the time to navigate bureaucracy or the waiting period to receive the documents in the mail—is prohibitive, and yet familiar. Anyone who has waited in line at the DMV must understand what a mistake this is.

I do not argue with the notion that we must prevent individuals from voting who are not allowed to vote. Yet a hidden argument in this bill is that immigrants may “infiltrate” our voting system. Legal immigrants who have successfully navigated the citizenship maze are unlikely to draw the attention of the authorities by attempting to register incorrectly. Similarly, undocumented immigrants are even less likely to risk deportation just to influence an election.

If for no other reason than Hurricane Katrina, we must all understand how vulnerable our system is. Families fleeing the hurricanes last summer suffered loss of property that included lost documents. Compounding this was the devastation of the region, which virtually shut down civil services in the area. New Orleans residents were scattered across 44 States. And had difficulty registering and voting both with absentee ballots and at satellite voting stations for the April 22 city elections this year. Those elections took place fully 8 months after the disaster, and it required the efforts of non-profits, such as the NAACP, to ensure that voters had the access they are constitutionally guaranteed.

In addition, this bill hands State governments yet another unfunded mandate. By 2010, we must all submit photo IDs with proof of citizenship in order to vote. Currently, no more than 4 States have driver’s licenses or IDs that match these requirements. The only other document that does satisfy this requirement is a passport. Therefore, every State that does not have this kind of photo ID must restructure and create the ID system to provide adequate voting permits for everyone who does not have an updated passport with a current address. This would involve reissuing driver’s licenses or identification cards in almost every State.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing H.R. 4844 would cost about \$1 million in 2007 and \$77 million over the 2007–2011 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. This exceeds the allowed amounts in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. In addition, CBO estimates that the cost of providing photo identification for voters who cannot afford them would be about \$45 million in 2008.

This is simply ludicrous. We need to address the election fraud that we know is occurring, such as voting machine integrity and poll volunteer training and competence. After every election that occurs in this country, we have documented evidence of voting inconsistencies and errors. In 2004, in New Mexico, malfunctioning machines mysteriously failed to properly register a presidential vote on more than 20,000 ballots. One million ballots nationwide were spoiled by faulty voting equipment—roughly one for every 100 cast.

Those who face the most significant barriers are not only the poor, minorities, and rural populations. 1.5 million college students, whose addresses change often, and the elderly, will also have difficulty providing documentation.

In fact, newly married individuals face significant barriers to completing a change in surname. For instance, it can take 6–8 weeks to receive the marriage certificate in the mail, another 2 weeks (and a full day waiting in line) to get the new Social Security card, and finally, 3–4 weeks to get the new driver's license. There is a significant possibility that this bill will also prohibit newlyweds from voting if they are married within 3 months of election day.

An election with integrity is one that is open to every eligible voter. Restrictive voter ID requirements degrade the integrity of our elections by systematically excluding large numbers of eligible Americans.

The right to vote is a critical and sacred constitutionally protected civil right. To challenge this is to erode our democracy, challenge justice, and mock our moral standing. I urge my colleagues to join me in dismissing this crippling legislation, and pursue effective solutions to the real problems of election fraud and error. We cannot let the rhetoric of an election year destroy a fundamental right upon which we have established liberty and freedom.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1015, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I am opposed at this present time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Millender-McDonald moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4844 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. REQUIRING VOTERS TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION AS CONDITION OF RECEIVING BALLOT.—Section 303(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15483(b)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "FOR VOTERS WHO REGISTER BY MAIL" and inserting "FOR PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATION"; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

"(1) INDIVIDUALS VOTING IN PERSON.—

"(A) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE IDENTIFICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the appropriate State or local election official may not provide a ballot for an election for Federal office to an individual who desires to vote in person unless the individual presents to the official—

"(i) a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification; or

"(ii) in the case of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2010 and each subsequent election for Federal office, a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification for which the individual was required to provide proof of United States citizenship as a condition for the issuance of the identification.

"(B) AVAILABILITY OF PROVISIONAL BALLOT.—If an individual does not present the identification required under subparagraph (A), the individual shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot with respect to the election under section 302(a), except that the appropriate State or local election official may not make a determination under section 302(a)(4) that the individual is eligible under State law to vote in the election unless the individual presents the identification required under subparagraph (A) to the official not later than 48 hours after casting the provisional ballot.

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED VOTERS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to any elderly or handicapped individual. In this subparagraph, the terms 'elderly' and 'handicapped' have the meanings given such terms in section 8 of the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee–6).

"(D) EXCEPTION FOR VICTIMS OF HURRICANE KATRINA.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to any individual who certifies to the appropriate election official that the documentation which would enable the individual to obtain the identification required under such subparagraph was lost or destroyed as a result of Hurricane Katrina.

"(2) INDIVIDUALS VOTING OTHER THAN IN PERSON.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), the appropriate State or local election official may not accept any ballot for an election for Federal office provided by an individual who votes other than in person unless the individual submits with the ballot—

"(i) a copy of a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification; or

"(ii) in the case of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2010 and each subsequent election for Federal office, a copy of a government-issued, current, and valid photo identification for which the individual was required to provide proof of United States citizenship as a condition for the issuance of the identification.

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR ABSENT MILITARY VOTERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to a ballot provided by an absent uniformed services voter. In this subparagraph, the term 'absent uniformed services voter' has the meaning given such term in section 107(1) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff–6(1)).

"(C) EXCEPTION FOR ELDERLY AND DISABLED VOTERS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to a ballot provided by an elderly or handicapped individual. In this subparagraph, the terms 'elderly' and 'handicapped' have the meanings given such terms in section 8 of the Voting Accessibility for the El-

derly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee–6)).

"(D) EXCEPTION FOR VICTIMS OF HURRICANE KATRINA.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to any individual who certifies to the appropriate election official that the documentation which would enable the individual to obtain the identification required under such subparagraph was lost or destroyed as a result of Hurricane Katrina.

"(3) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATIONS.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2)—

"(A) an identification is 'government-issued' if it is issued by the Federal Government or by the government of a State; and

"(B) an identification is one for which an individual was required to provide proof of United States citizenship as a condition for issuance if the identification displays an official marking or other indication that the individual is a United States citizen."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 303 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15483) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "FOR VOTERS WHO REGISTER BY MAIL" and inserting "FOR PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATION"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "subsections (a)(5)(A)(i)(II) and (b)(3)(B)(i)(II)" and inserting "subsection (a)(5)(A)(i)(II)".

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by amending the item relating to section 303 to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. Computerized statewide voter registration list requirements and requirements for providing photo identification".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2008 and each subsequent election for Federal office.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 303(d)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15483(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2008 and each subsequent election for Federal office."

(3) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or section 303(d)(2) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as amended by paragraph (2)), this section and the amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to any election which is held in a State during a fiscal year for which the amount provided to the State pursuant to the authorization under section 297A of such Act (as added by section 3(c)) is not sufficient to cover the costs incurred by the State in carrying out the amendments made by section 3.

SEC. 3. MAKING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS AVAILABLE.

(a) REQUIRING STATES TO MAKE IDENTIFICATION AVAILABLE.—Section 303(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15483(b)), as amended by section 2(a)(2), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) MAKING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS AVAILABLE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year, each State shall establish a program to provide photo identifications which may be used to meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) by individuals who desire to vote in elections held in the State but who do not otherwise

possess a government-issued photo identification.

“(B) IDENTIFICATIONS PROVIDED AT NO COST TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS.—If a State charges an individual a fee for providing a photo identification under the program established under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the fee charged may not exceed the reasonable cost to the State of providing the identification to the individual; and

“(ii) the State may not charge a fee to any individual who provides an attestation that the individual is unable to afford the fee.

“(C) IDENTIFICATIONS NOT TO BE USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—Any photo identification provided under the program established under subparagraph (A) may not serve as a government-issued photo identification for purposes of any program or function of a State or local government other than the administration of elections.”

(b) REPORT ON NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS UNABLE TO CAST BALLOTS AS A RESULT OF PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 303(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15483(b)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) REPORT ON NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS UNABLE TO CAST BALLOTS AS A RESULT OF PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Not later than December 31 of each year during which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held (beginning with 2008), each State shall submit a report to the Commission on the number of individuals in the State who were registered to vote with respect to the election but who were prohibited from casting a ballot in the election, or whose provisional ballots were not counted in the election, because they failed to meet the requirements of paragraph (1) or (2).”

(c) PAYMENTS TO STATES TO COVER COSTS.—Subtitle D of title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART 7—PAYMENTS TO COVER COSTS OF PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS

“SEC. 297. PAYMENTS TO COVER COSTS TO STATES OF PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS FOR VOTING TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—The Commission shall make payments to States to cover the costs incurred in providing photo identifications under the program established under section 303(b)(4) to individuals who are unable to afford the fee that would otherwise be charged under the program.

“(b) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment made to a State under this part for any year shall be equal to the amount of fees which would have been collected by the State during the year under the program established under section 303(b)(4) but for the application of section 303(b)(4)(B)(ii), as determined on the basis of information furnished to the Commission by the State at such time and in such form as the Commission may require.

“SEC. 297A. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated for payments under this part such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year.”

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the item relating to subtitle D of title II the following:

“PART 7—PAYMENTS TO COVER COSTS OF PROVIDING PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS TO INDIGENT INDIVIDUALS

“Sec. 297. Payments to cover costs to States of providing photo identifications for voting to indigent individuals.

“Sec. 297A. Authorization of appropriations.”

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2007.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW VOTER IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING FOR STATES.—The amendments made by this Act shall not take effect unless—

(1) the amount provided to States pursuant to the authorization under section 297A of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by section 3(c)) is sufficient to cover the costs to the States of meeting the requirements of section 303(b)(4) of such Act (as added by section 3(a)); and

(2) the amount provided to States for requirements payments under subtitle D of title II of such Act is sufficient to cover the costs to the States of meeting the requirements of title III of such Act (other than section 303(b)(4)), taking into account the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this Act.

(b) REQUIRING ACCESS TO PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW REQUIREMENTS.—The amendments made by this Act shall not take effect unless the Election Assistance Commission reports to Congress that not less than 95 percent of the voting age population of the United States has obtained photo identification which meets the requirements of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 which are added by the amendments made by this Act, and that individuals who were not able to afford the fee imposed by a State for the identification were provided the identification free of charge by the State.

(c) REQUIRING CERTIFICATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL, CHIEF STATE ELECTION OFFICIAL, AND GOVERNOR PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW REQUIREMENTS IN STATE.—

(1) CERTIFICATION.—The amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to elections held in a State unless the chief executive of the State, the chief State election official of the State, and the Attorney General certify to Congress that, on the basis of clear and convincing evidence—

(A) voting by noncitizens in the State is a persistent and significant problem; and

(B) the remedies and prohibitions applicable under the laws in effect prior to the implementation of the amendments made by this Act are insufficient to prevent and deter this problem.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “chief State election official” has the meaning given such term in section 253(e) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15403(e)); and

(B) the term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 901 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 15541).

(d) STUDY AND REPORT ON ANTICIPATED EFFECT OF IMPLEMENTATION ON PARTICIPATION BY ELDERLY, DISABLED, NATIVE AMERICANS AND MINORITY VOTERS.—The amendments made by this Act shall not take effect unless the Election Assistance Commission—

(1) conducts a study on the anticipated impact of the amendments on voter participation; and

(2) submits a report to Congress on the study which concludes that the implementation of the amendments will not disproportionately affect voter participation by the elderly, the disabled, Native Americans, and members of racial minorities.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if the House is going to vote out a proof-of-citizenship requirement to allow citizens to exercise their constitutional right to vote, then we should consider who will be disenfranchised by this new requirement, and we should ensure that the States have both the funds and have determined their needs to implement this mandate.

Of course, we should exempt those who will be greatly burdened and are least likely to fit the straw man profile which the majority has thrown up as its excuse to pass this bill, voting by noncitizens. There is no showing that this straw man is a problem of sufficient proportions to justify a 21st century poll tax.

There is no empirical data on which to justify this unfunded mandate, and the personal financial burden and, in some cases, the sheer impossibility of citizens to obtain the required documentation must be taken into consideration.

I therefore offer a motion to recommit, which does the following things to the Republican proof-of-citizenship photo ID obstacle to voting.

First, the motion to recommit exempts all military voters and their families from the requirement of submitting a copy of their photo ID when mailing in an absentee ballot, not just those uniformed personnel overseas, as the underlying Hyde bill allows.

Second, my motion exempts all elderly and disabled voters from having to provide their photo ID at polls or when mailing in absentee ballots. They have financial and access obstacles which ordinary citizens simply do not have, and we need to recognize and adjust for that.

Third, the motion prevents the bill from taking effect in any State and during any fiscal year in which the Federal Government is acting irresponsibly by not providing sufficient Federal funds to cover the State costs of the unfunded mandate of making photo IDs available.

Fourth, my motion to recommit empowers the States by requiring that this new proof of citizenship photo ID provision will not take effect until the State's chief executive, chief election officer, and attorney general have each certified to Congress that voting by noncitizens in the State is a persistent and significant problem that can't be resolved by existing State and Federal laws.

Fifth, the motion seeks to enlighten the Congress on the impact of this law by having States issue a report to the Election Assistance Commission on the number of individuals who are

disenfranchised because of a photo ID requirement.

Sixth, the motion seeks to temper the likely effects of this harsh new statute by holding its application in abeyance until the Election Assistance Commission reports to Congress that 95 percent of the voting-age population has acquired a photo ID which meets the requirements of this act.

Seventh, my motion prevents the law from taking effect until the Election Assistance Commission studies and reports to Congress that the photo ID law will not disproportionately disenfranchise the elderly, disabled, minority and Native Americans.

Finally, the motion exempts Katrina victims whose records were destroyed and who were unable to obtain the requisite documentation, as long as they certify under penalty of perjury to the appropriate State election officials.

These are major concerns but by no means the only ones.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Would the gentlewoman yield just for one moment?

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is very important on two points. The poll tax, which is a very important point of our argument, it has been said this is not a poll tax. It has been said that this is not an unfunded mandate. However, it is important to know that at the same time they say that this effort will be paid for, but there is no funding in this bill to pay for it, that makes it an unfunded mandate. That puts the onus on the individual senior citizens, those without it. Therefore, this was the consideration for the Georgia ruling that it was a poll tax and unconstitutional.

It is also important to note within the case in Georgia it was pointed out that clearly there were 600,000 Georgians, and not just Georgians, but registered voters in Georgia, 600,000, who did not have either a driver's license or a birth certificate. In order for that to happen, they would have had to provide the costs for doing so, which was not in the bill.

Subsequently, the Governor of Georgia said, to solve this we will put a bus to travel, follow it around the State. The bus made it for 2 hours and broke down. I wanted to make that clear for the Georgia record.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to respond without having seen the text of this beforehand, but it appears clear to me that it has the purpose to provide a number of exceptions. Our bill does not provide exceptions, because we are interested in ensuring that every voter has the right to vote. We also want to ensure that there are no illegal votes cast.

References have been made to unfunded mandate. The House just de-

feated that suggestion and said there is no unfunded mandate. There are concerns about no money being provided. Our committee, the House Administration Committee, is an authorizing committee, not an appropriations committee.

If this bill is unfunded, it is simply because we are an authorizing committee, and any bill passed by an authorizing committee is unfunded. We have to follow the procedures here. We pass authorizing bills. The appropriators then provide the money to implement authorizing activities.

I strongly urge the Members of the body to recommit this bill and to pass the original version of the bill, as amended, and which was introduced to this body and debated for the last 2 hours. It is a good bill that will provide the safety and security we need to ensure the vote is taken properly. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4844, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 976.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 225, not voting 11, as follows

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—196

Abercrombie	Cardoza	Doyle
Ackerman	Carnahan	Edwards
Allen	Carson	Emanuel
Andrews	Chandler	Engel
Baca	Clay	Eshoo
Baird	Cleaver	Etheridge
Baldwin	Clyburn	Farr
Barrow	Conyers	Fattah
Bean	Cooper	Filner
Becerra	Costa	Ford
Berkley	Costello	Frank (MA)
Berman	Cramer	Gonzalez
Berry	Crowley	Gordon
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Boren	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Harman
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Boyd	Davis (TN)	Herseth
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Higgins
Brown (OH)	DeGette	Hinchee
Brown, Corrine	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Butterfield	DeLauro	Holden
Capps	Dicks	Holt
Capuano	Dingell	Honda
Cardin	Doggett	Hooley

Hoyer	Melancon	Sanders
Inslee	Michaud	Schakowsky
Israel	Millender-	Schiff
Jackson (IL)	McDonald	Schwartz (PA)
Jackson-Lee	Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)
(TX)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Jefferson	Mollohan	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (WI)	Sherman
Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Kanjorski	Murtha	Slaughter
Kaptur	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Kildee	Napolitano	Snyder
Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)	Solis
Kind	Oberstar	Spratt
Kucinich	Obey	Stark
Langevin	Olver	Stupak
Lantos	Ortiz	Tanner
Larsen (WA)	Owens	Tauscher
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Lee	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pastor	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Tierney
Lipinski	Pelosi	Towns
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
Lowey	Pomeroy	Udall (NM)
Lynch	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Maloney	Rahall	Velázquez
Markey	Rangel	Visclosky
Matheson	Reyes	Wasserman
Matsui	Ross	Schultz
McCarthy	Rothman	Waters
McCollum (MN)	Roybal-Allard	Watson
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Watt
McGovern	Rush	Waxman
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
McKinney	Sabo	Wexler
McNulty	Salazar	Woolsey
Meehan	Sánchez, Linda	Wu
Meek (FL)	T.	Wynn
Meeke (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	

NAYS—225

Aderholt	English (PA)	Kline
Akin	Everett	Knollenberg
Alexander	Feeney	Kolbe
Bachus	Ferguson	Kuhl (NY)
Baker	Fitzpatrick (PA)	LaHood
Barrett (SC)	Flake	Latham
Bartlett (MD)	Foley	LaTourette
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Leach
Bass	Fortenberry	Lewis (CA)
Beauprez	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Biggert	Fox	Linder
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Blackburn	Galleghy	Lungren, Daniel
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Boehler	Gerlach	Mack
Boehner	Gibbons	Manzullo
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Marchant
Bonner	Gillmor	Marshall
Bono	Gingrey	McCaul (TX)
Boozman	Gohmert	McCotter
Boustany	Goode	McCrery
Bradley (NH)	Goodlatte	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Granger	McHugh
Brown (SC)	Graves	McKeon
Brown-Waite,	Green (WI)	McMorris
Ginny	Gutknecht	Rodgers
Burgess	Hall	Mica
Burton (IN)	Harris	Miller (FL)
Buyer	Hart	Miller (MI)
Camp (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Campbell (CA)	Hayes	Moran (KS)
Cannon	Hayworth	Murphy
Cantor	Hefley	Musgrave
Capito	Hensarling	Myrick
Carter	Hergert	Neugebauer
Castle	Hobson	Northup
Chabot	Hoekstra	Norwood
Chocola	Hostettler	Nunes
Coble	Hulshof	Nussle
Cole (OK)	Hunter	Osborne
Conaway	Hyde	Otter
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Oxley
Culberson	Issa	Paul
Davis (KY)	Istook	Pearce
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Pence
Davis, Tom	Jindal	Peterson (PA)
Deal (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Petri
Dent	Johnson (IL)	Pickering
Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)	Platts
Doolittle	Kelly	Poe
Drake	Kennedy (MN)	Pombo
Dreier	King (IA)	Porter
Duncan	King (NY)	Price (GA)
Ehlers	Kingston	Pryce (OH)
Emerson	Kirk	Putnam

Radanovich Shadegg Thornberry
Ramstad Shaw Tiaht
Regula Shays Tiberi
Rehberg Sherwood Turner
Reichert Shimkus Upton
Renzi Shuster Walden (OR)
Rogers (AL) Simmons Walsh
Rogers (KY) Simpson Wamp
Rogers (MI) Smith (NJ) Weldon (FL)
Rohrabacher Smith (TX) Weldon (PA)
Ros-Lehtinen Sodrel Weller
Royce Souder Westmoreland
Ryan (WI) Stearns Whitfield
Ryan (KS) Sullivan Wicker
Saxton Sweeney Wilson (NM)
Schmidt Tancredo Wilson (SC)
Schwarz (MI) Taylor (NC) Wolf
Sensenbrenner Terry Young (AK)
Sessions Thomas Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (UT) Evans Ney
Calvert Keller Reynolds
Case Kennedy (RI) Strickland
Cubin Moore (KS)

□ 1550

Messrs. PICKERING, LUCAS, TERRY, NUNES, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, WALDEN of Oregon, HEFLEY, LAHOOD and GARY G. MILLER of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOLT and Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

YEAS—228

Aderholt Cantor Foxx
Akin Capito Franks (AZ)
Alexander Carter Frelinghuysen
Bachus Castle Gallegly
Baker Chabot Garrett (NJ)
Barrett (SC) Chocola Gerlach
Bartlett (MD) Coble Gibbons
Barton (TX) Cole (OK) Gilchrist
Bean Conaway Gillmor
Beauprez Crenshaw Gingrey
Biggart Culberson Gohmert
Bilbray Davis (KY) Goode
Bilirakis Davis, Jo Ann Goodlatte
Bishop (UT) Davis, Tom Granger
Blackburn Deal (GA) Graves
Blunt Dent Green (WI)
Boehlert Diaz-Balart, L. Gutknecht
Boehner Diaz-Balart, M. Hall
Bonilla Doolittle Harris
Bonner Drake Hart
Bono Dreier Hastings (WA)
Boozman Duncan Hayes
Boustany Ehlers Hayworth
Brady (TX) Emerson Hefley
Brown (SC) English (PA) Hensarling
Brown-Waite, Everett Herger
Ginny Feeney Hobson
Burgess Ferguson Hoekstra
Burton (IN) Fitzpatrick (PA) Hostettler
Buyer Flake Hulshof
Calvert Foley Hunter
Camp (MI) Forbes Hyde
Campbell (CA) Fortenberry Inglis (SC)
Cannon Fossella Issa

Istook Miller, Gary
Jenkins Moran (KS)
Jindal Murphy
Johnson (CT) Musgrave
King (IA) Myrick
Johnson, Sam Neugebauer
Jones (NC) Northup
Kelly Norwood
Kennedy (MN) Nunes
Nussle
King (NY) Osborne
Kingston Otter
Kirk Oxley
Kline Paul
Knollenberg Pearce
Kolbe Pence
Kuhl (NY) Peterson (MN)
LaHood Peterson (PA)
Latham Petri
LaTourette Pickering
Leach Pitts
Lewis (CA) Platts
Lewis (KY) Poe
Linder Pombo
LoBiondo Porter
Lucas Price (GA)
Lungren, Daniel Pryce (OH)
E. Putnam
Mack Radanovich
Manzullo Ramstad
Marchant Regula
Marshall Rehberg
McCaul (TX) Reichert
McCotter Renzi
McCrery Reynolds
McHenry Rogers (AL)
McHugh Rogers (KY)
McKeon Rogers (MI)
McMorris Rohrabacher
Rodgers Ros-Lehtinen
Mica Royce
Miller (FL) Ryan (WI)
Miller (MI) Ryun (KS)

NAYS—196

Abercrombie Doggett Maloney
Ackerman Doyle Markey
Allen Edwards Matheson
Andrews Emanuel Matsui
Baca Engel McCarthy
Baird Eshoo McCollum (MN)
Baldwin Etheridge McDermott
Barrow Farr McGovern
Bass Fattah McIntyre
Becerra Filner McKinney
Berkley Ford McNulty
Berman Frank (MA) Meehan
Berry Gonzalez Meek (FL)
Bishop (GA) Gordon Meeks (NY)
Bishop (NY) Green, Al Melancon
Blumenauer Green, Gene Michaud
Boren Grijalva Millender-
Boswell Gutierrez McDonald
Boucher Harman Miller (NC)
Boyd Hastings (FL) Miller, George
Bradley (NH) Hersth Mollohan
Brady (PA) Higgins Moore (WI)
Brown (OH) Hinchey Moran (VA)
Brown, Corrine Hinojosa Murtha
Butterfield Holden Nadler
Capps Holt Napolitano
Capuano Honda Neal (MA)
Cardin Hooley Oberstar
Cardoza Hoyer Obey
Carnahan Insee Oliver
Carson Israel Ortiz
Chandler Jackson (IL) Owens
Clay Jackson-Lee Pallone
Cleaver (TX) Pascrell
Clyburn Jefferson Pastor
Conyers Johnson, E. B. Payne
Cooper Jones (OH) Pelosi
Costa Kanjorski Pomeroy
Costello Kaptur Price (NC)
Cramer Kildee Rahall
Crowley Kilpatrick (MI) Rangel
Cuellar Kind Reyes
Cummings Kucinich Ross
Davis (AL) Langevin Rothman
Davis (CA) Lantos Roybal-Allard
Davis (FL) Larsen (WA) Ruppertsberger
Davis (TN) Larson (CT) Rush
DeFazio Lee Ryan (OH)
DeGette Lewis (GA) Sabo
DeLauro Lipinski Salazar
Dicks Lofgren, Zoe Sanchez, Linda
Dingell Lowey T.
Lynch Sanders

Schakowsky Stark Wasserman
Schiff Stupak Schultz
Schwarz (PA) Tanner Waters
Sensenbrenner Tauscher Watson
Sessions Thompson (CA) Watt
Shadegg Thompson (MS) Waxman
Shaw Tierney Weiner
Shays Towns Wexler
Sherwood Udall (CO) Woolsey
Shimkus Smith (VA) Udall (NM) Wu
Shuster Snyder Van Hollen Wynn
Simmons Solis Velázquez
Simpson Spratt Visclosky Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Case Keller Ney
Cubin Kennedy (RI) Strickland
Evans Moore (KS)

□ 1600

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require each individual who desires to vote in an election for Federal office to provide the appropriate election official with a government-issued photo identification, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CAPITOL HILL FLAG FOOTBALL

(Mr. RENZI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, last night on the gridiron of Gallaudet University, Republicans and Democrats came together in a bipartisan fashion to take on the Capitol Police professional flag football team. And while we are but a ragtag group of amateur players taking on professional athletes, in the end we had them right where we wanted, and if it wasn't for the clock running out, we would have had that big comeback and overcome that score of 35-7.

I want to thank the police officers who guard us and care for us, who have given their lives for us. I want to thank our sponsors. We have found in Washington that if you go to sponsors and tell them they can watch Congressmen get knocked over, you can raise money for police officers and their families.

I want to thank Coach Tom Osborne. He may be Nebraska's son and a Hall of Fame coach, but he is our sandlot coach, and we needed him. He helped us raise \$80,000 in two games for the families.

Thank you all to the players and the staffs that put this together. We are going to do it again next year. We are not going to go easy on them. Thank you, everybody. I appreciate it.